THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

ONE of the advantages of such a work as *A Companion to the Bible* (edited by Professor T. W. MANSON, and reviewed elsewhere) is that, when it is written by reliable experts, it tells us just where we are in regard to important critical questions. This is eminently true of the book referred to. In particular, Dr. MANSON himself contributes an informing statement of the way in which the New Testament began and grew to what it is.

The Primitive Church was not engaged in book-production but in preaching. The time had not arrived either for a Christian apologetic or for written records of the ministry of Jesus. The first witnesses were engaged in missionary activity. And the content of this earliest preaching was mainly this: 'Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah ben David, crucified, raised from the dead and exalted as Lord.' It is the story of the Cross put into theological form.

If we set beside this the conclusions reached by recent criticism of the Synoptic Gospels, we find that they confirm and illuminate each other in a striking way. For it is increasingly clear that the kernel of the Gospels is the Passion narrative, and it is precisely the Passion narrative that resists form-critical analysis. Thus we are led to the conclusion that the earliest composition of the Primitive Church, the germ of our New Testament, is the Passion narrative told as a piece of history and preached as a gospel. This is not a written document; but it may be conjectured that its form and content were fairly firmly fixed.

But, while the Passion narrative is the kernel of the earliest Gospel, it is not the whole of it. The Apostolic preaching sees the Passion as the culmination of the ministry (Ac 2^{22} 10^{38}). It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the early oral tradition prefixed to the Passion narrative an outline of the ministry with stories illustrating its purpose and method.

Further, a large part of the activity of Jesus had been teaching addressed to all kinds of audiences. It was inevitable that this too should be treasured up in the memories of those who heard it, and repeated when believers met together. When new members were added to the community they must be instructed about the kind of life that Jesus had prescribed for those who entered the Kingdom of God as His disciples.

Thus alongside of the oral tradition about the crucified Messiah ben David there would grow up the oral tradition of the teaching of Jesus. This latter first took written form in the document known as Q, which was used by the authors of Matthew and Luke. By comparison of these two Gospels we can reconstruct Q with a fair amount of probability, though we cannot be certain that all of it has been incorporated in Matthew and

Luke, or that the exact wording has been preserved. Study of this document, thus reconstructed, leads to the conclusion that it was compiled primarily as a manual of instruction in the meaning of discipleship for the use of those who were converted by the preaching of the gospel.

It may be conjectured that the need for such a treatise would be felt most acutely as soon as the Church began to make converts in large numbers, and especially when converts began to be drawn from non-Jewish circles. This happened at Antioch (Ac 11^{19-26}), where there arose a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile Christians; and it is permissible to suppose that it was there that Q was written down in Aramaic and first translated into Greek, probably before the middle of the first century.

The question whether the statement of Papias preserved by Eusebius refers to Q is still in debate. In Professor MANSON's opinion the question ought to be answered in the affirmative, in which case the possibility emerges that Q was put together by the Matthew whose name appears in the list of the Twelve.

It is probable that other collections of material concerning the ministry were put together at an early date. There is, for example, the so-called 'Little Apocalypse' embedded in Mk 13; there is the collection of conflict-stories (Mk 2^{1}–3^{6}, 11^{27}–12^{34}); there is the mass of teaching peculiar to Matthew, which may be derived from a Jerusalem compilation made up on similar lines to Q perhaps about a decade later than that document. And more besides.

In fact, it becomes increasingly likely th the process by which the oral tradition was reduced to writing and finally presented in the Gospels was a good deal more complicated than we usually think; and that much of the material, which was later incorporated in the Gospels, was in written form at an earlier date than is commonly allowed. If we ask what literature the Church possessed at the time when Paul and Barnabas set out on the first missionary journey, the answer will be: the Old Testament; an outline of the ministry of Jesus and a detailed account of the Passion, the latter in a fixed form if not written down; a collection of the teachings of Jesus (Q) probably in writing; possibly other collections of material —parables, conflict-stories, proof texts from the Old Testament, either written down or on the way to being written down.

With regard to the Gospels as we have them, Dr. MANSON accepts the tradition that connects Mark with Rome, St. Peter and John Mark. He also accepts the statement that Mark embodies recollections of the oral teaching of Peter. There is internal evidence for this. The contents of Mark seem to be 'the outcome of genuine historical tradition.' We are dealing with the products of memory, not of imagination.

Matthew is a revised and enlarged edition of Mark. The enlargement consists mainly in the addition of narrative matter at the beginning and end of the story; the incorporation of five great discourses, and the introduction of proof-texts from the Old Testament. The additional matter is derived partly from a source or sources peculiar to this Gospel (M) and partly from Q. Dr. MANSON concludes from the evidence that Matthew is a Greek document making use of Greek sources, and that the Church tradition that the Gospel was composed by Matthew in the 'Hebrew dialect' (Aramaic) is wrong. The author is unknown. From the internal evidence it may be guessed that he was a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian of Palestine.

Dr. MANSON is interesting and suggestive about the Third Gospel. He accepts the Lucan authorship, and thinks we have here the first piece of Christian apologetic. The Gospel was not written for ecclesiastical use but for publication, to commend the new religion to the Empire. Its sources are Mark, Q, and a special source peculiar to Luke (L). The first stage was probably the bringing

together of Q and L to form a document about the size of Mark. This may have taken place at Cæsarea during Paul's detention there. Later, material from Mark was added and the Birth and Infancy narratives were prefixed to produce the Gospel as we know it. The date is probably A.D. 75–85.

These are the main conclusions, we may take it, of contemporary criticism. The discerning reader will see how the truth in Form-Criticism is worked into the theory. There is, perhaps, too much of 'probable,' 'may be' and even 'possible' for our complete comfort. But, after all, a high degree of probability is all history can give us. And critics like Dr. MANSON are very honest. And it may be said that his results are in their broad effect very reassuring. They point with a large measure of certainty to the trustworthiness of the Gospel narratives.

It has been justly claimed that Dr. W. B. SELBIE, now Principal Emeritus of Mansfield College, Oxford, made a real contribution in his 'The Psychology of Religion' to the subject of the bearing of the so-called new psychology (that of the schools of Freud, Jung, and Adler) upon the Christian faith. Since he published that work the subject has clarified itself further in his mind, and now his mature judgment on the tenets of the new psychology and their bearing on religion is set forth in a recent volume of 'The Christian Challenge Series' which appears under the title, *Christianity and the New Psychology* (Centenary Press; 3s. 6d. net).

Like the wise householder in the parable, Principal SELBIE brings out of his treasury things both new and old. And he assembles them before his readers in simple, clear, and impressive fashion. There is nothing here to mislead or bewilder.

The burden of the book is that psychology, while useful up to a point, has its limitations. It is not philosophy or theology, and is not to be confounded with one of these. But there is a place for it in the Christian life, even for the new psychology; psycho-analysis may have valuable uses. Let us illustrate the two points herein contained.

First, the limitations of psychology. There is a tendency among the later psychologists to foist upon their legitimate findings on religious matters illegitimate philosophical or theological theories, chiefly of a negative sort. But this tendency should be resisted. It should be clearly observed that psychology has to do mainly, if not exclusively, with the subjective side of religion, and that questions of objective reality lie beyond its 'universe of discourse.'

Speaking of psychology applied to religion, Principal SELBIE says: 'Its concern is not with doctrines, but with facts, states of consciousness, religious phenomena, rather than religion. It purports to be scientific and to confine itself strictly to classifying, observing, experimenting, and drawing conclusions. It thus provides a great deal of valuable and interesting material for study, which men may use as seems good to them. It all has the effect of helping us to understand that religion is no excrescence or after-thought, but an integral part of man's make-up and of his reaction to the universe. That is all to the good, but, though it bears on the question, it cannot throw any light on the truth or reality of religion. Psychologists mostly recognize this, but their recognition would be more impressive if they did not sometimes assume that their science tends to do the opposite, that is, reduce all religion to illusion. But if they cannot prove the truth of religion, neither can they prove its falsity. They can only provide material which must be taken into consideration by all those who would justify religion either to themselves or to the world at large.'

Secondly, the uses of psychology. Principal SELBIE seeks to show in the course of his discussions that psychology, and in particular the new psychology, can be as powerful a weapon in the hands of those who would defend Christianity as in the

hands of those who would destroy it. He freely allows that psycho-analysis as a means of treating nervous disorders has fairly established itself, though repudiating the assumption or inference that human nature and action are mere automatism, and God a mere projection. But supporting a statement by an American psychotherapist, he writes: 'As a method of diagnosis psycho-analysis is invaluable, but it must be followed by psycho-synthesis if it is to effect lasting cures, and in the synthesizing process religion must play a great, if not the leading, part. Many psychotherapists acknowledge this, and willingly admit that faith, prayer, penitence, and confession are most valuable aids in ministering to the mind diseased.'

This seems to be as far as psychology can take us into the ontological sphere of philosophy or theology. But we should be warned that this merely pragmatic proof of the reality of religion is easily converted into the affirmation that religion is no more than a system of psychotherapy and God a mere convenience to be used only when needed. As against such an affirmation it should be maintained that while spiritual healing is a reality, it is incidental to religion rather than its main business. Wholeness is greater than health. We commend to our readers Principal SELBIE'S wise discussion at this point of the subject of spiritual healing.

It is inevitable that men's minds should be preoccupied with the war. It raises an almost endless variety of problems, and not least in the moral and religious sphere. It lays on every Christian preacher the obligation to seek, under the guidance of the Word and Spirit of God, to understand the crisis and to interpret it aright to his people.

A little book which may be found very helpful in this connexion has just been published. Its title is *Why Does God Allow War,* by the Rev. D. Martyn LLOYD-JONES (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). The writer, who, as is well known, is the associate minister of Westminster Chapel, preached recently a series of five sermons in which he endeavoured to set forth 'a general justification of the ways of God.' The writing is robust and vigorous in tone, and is packed full of sound Christian teaching. Problems are faced fearlessly and there is a marked aversion to take refuge in merely pious but ill-grounded sentiment. The fourth sermon in the series, which bears the same title as the book and deals especially with the war, is perhaps the best and most timely. A few notes upon it will serve to give some idea of the quality of the book.

In the attitude of religious minds to the war there are two tendencies manifest. On the one hand, there are many who discuss the whole problem of war solely from the human point of view, as a thing apart from God or related to Him only in a very indirect manner. They seek out the causes of war in the political and economic spheres, and they interest themselves in considering what the Christian man's attitude to war should be. This seems to be the chief concern of Pacifists, who never appear to raise the practical problem of the direct relationship of God to war. Of course, they would say that to them it is a fundamental postulate that 'the very idea of war is abhorrent to God, and of necessity has nothing to do directly with God because it is the result of man's sin and folly.'

There are others who feel that this does not go deep enough. They are confronted as we all are with the problem of how war affects man, and in particular of how the Christian man should relate himself to war. But beyond and beneath all that they feel themselves faced with the problem of how war is to be fitted into God's governance of this world. 'In a word, what perplexes these people most of all is not the explanation of the origin of war, or their own immediate duty with respect to it; what they desire to know is, "Why does God allow or permit war?" That is to them the question of all questions, because on the answer to it depends the whole of their belief in God.'

Why does God allow war? The question may be asked defiantly in unbelief by those who regard war as the complete refutation of the Christian's faith in a God of love. With such people it is obviously useless to discuss the particular point until more central questions of the faith are settled. But there are believing minds to whom the problem of war brings serious perplexity. It is obvious that many Christians of to-day, in their thought of God, have stressed the attribute of divine love almost to the entire exclusion of all else. 'This shows itself in normal times in the view they hold of the subject of forgiveness, their representation being that God as love forgives without any conditions whatsoever, as if His righteousness and holiness were non-existent. The idea that God should under any circumstances punish is altogether foreign to their whole outlook. The one activity they recognize in God is His forgiveness, and His benevolent attitude towards mankind.' Holding this view of God they cannot understand how He can possibly allow war, with all its cruelty and suffering. As their own tenderness of heart would prompt them to stop the war if they had the power, they ask in bewilderment why does not God, who surely has the power, stop the war?

Now it is sometimes useful to answer one question by asking another, and in answer to the question, 'Why does God permit war?' there are two questions which may be thrown out as a challenge. The first is, Has God ever promised to prohibit war? The second is, Why *should* God stop the war?

Has God ever promised to prohibit war? Many form their impression of what God is and what He ought to do from the ideas current in their day and not from the teaching of God's own Word. As sin is treated lightly and human prosperity and happiness are regarded as the chief end, they reach the conclusion that this must be, for God also, the supreme interest. But when we allow our thought of God to be guided by His Word, we find that nowhere is a promise given that this sinful world shall be free from strife and war. Our Lord Himself predicted that to the end of the present age there would be wars and rumours of wars, for 'nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom.' The whole teaching of the New Testament is that the battle between good and evil, with all its attendant miseries and horrors, shall continue with bitterness till the final victory. In view of such a prospect our Lord says, 'See that ye be not troubled,' and those whose faith rests upon the Word are not troubled and shaken in soul because they see that so long as sin continues the world must suffer from its fearful ravages.

The other question is, Why should God stop the war? The answer would no doubt be that it is in the interest of human well-being that we should have peace. But before we are so sure of that we should searchingly ask ourselves the question—Why do we desire peace? What use do we intend to make of it? To glorify God or to gratify our own lusts? To serve His kingdom or to pursue our own selfish pleasures and worldly ends? As a matter of history what use did our people make of the peace which was granted at the end of the last war? Is it not the case that many who carried themselves nobly during the war, broke loose at its close and lived regardless of God's holy law? 'Men and women in this and every other country gave themselves to a life of pleasure-seeking, accompanied by spiritual and mental indolence. This became evident not only in the decline of religion, but still more markedly in the appalling decline in morals; and indeed, finally, even in a decline in a political and social sense.' The question then comes to be, Is there any interest of the Kingdom of God to be served by substituting for the horrors of war the godlessness and sensuality of a rotten peace? When, like the aged Zacharias, we ask God to deliver us out of the hand of our enemies in order that we may 'serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life,' only then have we a right to pray for peace with any confidence that our prayers will be heard.

Why does God allow war? That question cannot be isolated from the whole Christian view of sin and of God's government of a sinful world.

War is a consequence of sin, doubtless a very dreadful consequence. 'The Bible does not isolate war, as if it were something separate and unique and quite apart, as we tend to do in our thinking. It is but one of the manifestations of sin. On a larger scale, perhaps, and in a more terrible form for that reason, but still, in its essence, precisely the same as all the other effects and consequences of sin.' All sin leads to misery and loss, but because the working out of this particular sin is so manifestly disastrous, men begin to cry out for God to intervene and, by an exercise of His almighty power, save them from the evils that have come upon them. But why do not men ask to be saved from the evils consequent upon other sins? While they pray and expect God to stop war, why do they not also ask God to stop the miseries consequent upon drunkenness and immorality? 'But if any one ventured to suggest that, a protest loud and strong would be registered immediately in the name of freedom. We boast of our free will and resent any suggestion or teaching that God should in any way interfere with it. And yet, when, as the result of the exercise of that very freedom, we find ourselves faced with the horrors and troubles and sufferings of a war, like peevish children we cry out our protests and complain bitterly against God because He has not used His almighty power and forcibly prevented it.'

It is a fundamental principle of God's moral government of the world that those who sin must bear the consequences of their sin. 'Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.' If, like Cadmus, we sow dragon's teeth in the furrows we may expect a crop of armed men and murderous strife. And because, for our solace and comfort, we are linked together in families and nations, we must bear one another's burdens and share the bitter fruits of each others' sins. Without this firm moral foundation and without this solidarity, human life as we know it would be impossible.

This does not mean that God's government is a cast-iron and soulless system. On the contrary, it is animated with a redemptive purpose through and through. Its design is to unmask sin and deliver men from its power. Sin is counted pleasant and dearly loved. But war, above almost anything else, shows its grim and hideous reality. And this, surely, is a lesson which our generation especially needed to learn. Not only did men sin, but they sinned with a light heart. They openly boasted that nobody nowadays worries about sin. Now it would seem that God is teaching in dreadful wise, as even the blindest must see, how terrible a thing sin is and how desperately wicked is the heart of man. By the hammer blows of war this is being beaten into the nations in order that, learning through bitter experience the deadly nature of sin, they may turn in penitence and faith to Him who will have mercy upon them.

The Outlook for Missions.

By the Reverend Cecil Northcott, M.A., Home Secretary, London Missionary Society.

A few weeks after the war broke out the Government called a representative meeting of responsible officers of the British Missionary Societies to discuss with them the place of missions in war time. It was a private meeting and no public report may be made. But one statement, made by the secretary of a large society, may be mentioned here. Facing the representatives of the Government, he reminded them that, 'War is only a temporary happening. The Church of God is permanent.'

It sounded like an untruth in that bureaucratic building, with its corridors echoing with scurrying messengers. But it is a profound truth, and in that 'state of emergency' atmosphere it rang out plainly and firmly.

The fact that 'War is only a temporary happening' does not, unhappily, make its effects temporary. This war is already having permanent effects on the World Church, and especially on that part of it which finds its home in these islands. And it is about the foreign missionary enterprise of these 'home churches' that I want to draw some attention in this article. I want to look at it from the home standpoint, but not necessarily entirely with the war in mind. It is too early yet to make any estimate of what the war's permanent effect will be on the churches of Britain, and their missionary enterprise in particular.

I.

Missionary terminology is notoriously unhelpful. We strive to avoid the word 'foreign' and substitute 'overseas,' and for 'younger churches' we use the word 'partners,' and there is also the jargon of 'sending' and 'receiving' countries. To these is now added the word 'œcumenical' to supersede the word 'international.' All these words are used in the vast undertaking of trying to educate the Church in Britain in the fact of the World Church. An undertaking in which many thousands of pounds are spent annually and which occupies the whole time of many able staffs.

But the British churches remain very insular in their outlook, and the greatest handicap of the missionary enterprise is the high percentage of ignorance about the activities and achievements of the World Church. Writing of these achievements in *The Christian News-Letter Supplement*, Dr. Paton says: 'The ordinary Christian in our country is too little conscious of this and knows too little about it. He knows a good deal about the failures and weaknesses of the Church. He does not let himself draw the inspiration that he might, not from what men have done in the Church, but from what God has done and what He offers through it to mankind.'

The better education of the ministry in the facts of the World Church would be a great help in dispelling this cloud of ignorance. I think it is correct to say that in no theological college in Britain is there systematic instruction in the modern expansion of the Church, which has been more rapid and more widely spread in the last century and a half than in any period of Christian history. Up till recently there has been no adequate text-book available, but Professor Latourette's great volumes, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, now appearing, may fill this gap. For the key to the education of the local church is the minister. Without his teaching, ministry, and leadership, little progress can be made.

In the lifetime of people aged fifty we have passed through a great formative period in Church history in which the Church has taken root in some sixty-nine different countries. It has been an era of much patient missionary work, but also an era of planning in which the great conferences of Edinburgh, Jerusalem, Oxford, and Madras have played a strategic part. Whatever effect the war may have on the World Church and her missionary enterprise, this work remains.

The growth of the œcumenical sense, too, makes the phrase 'home churches' out of date. There are no 'home churches.' Britain is a mission field as well as China, but the need of Britain is seen more

clearly when looked at from the standpoint of the World Church. For the missionary enterprise is searching. It demands a strong, authoritative theology and a redemptive religion. It acts, in the Pauline sense, as a wise tutor in Christ to the whole Church, keeping the Church centred, in worship and witness, on the great facts of the faith.

II.

One young missionary, after his first term of service in China, said to me: 'Only the gospel of millions perishing without Christ is big enough to win the world.' He was right. It is this sense of urgency which the missionary gospel preserves and on which its drive depends. Only the conviction of the Lordship of Christ over the kingdoms of the world, and the finality of His revelation of God is competent to carry the audacious claims of Christianity.

It is the lack of this conviction which still causes the objections to missions to be raised. They vary in emphasis and variety, but the main ones are still—'One religion is as good as another'; 'There is more need at home'; 'Don't interfere—they have their religion'; 'It spoils the natives.' But in my experience they are not asked in a critical, debatable manner, but because they arise from a deep misgiving about the whole business of missions, and their place in the modern world. No amount of argument will finally settle such questions, but only an understanding of the fundamental impulse which makes the gospel a missionary gospel.

Dr. Kraemer has stated that impulse in *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World.* 'The only valid and indestructible foundation of missions,' he says, 'is the apostolic consciousness of joyful obedience to God's Will as manifested in the revelation in Christ, and our gratitude for this Divine Gift. All questions of superiority in the fields of cultural achievement, or psychological religious experience are irrelevant in this context. No pretensions whatever, derived from presumably superior ethical or religious or cultural elements, have anything to do with the apostolic claim and obligation of Christianity. Its only foundation is the objective and plain reality of God's revelation in Christ, and therefore, speaking fundamentally, it is quite immaterial whether the world asks for it or not.'

All questions about the right to evangelize and convert, which deeply trouble many thinking people in our churches, are answered when this 'apostolic motive' is recognized, and the humanitarian motives for Christian missions, such as 'sharing a religious experience,' 'social service,' 'fellowship with other religions,' fall into their rightful places. To regard any one of these as an adequate motive for Christian missions means the suicide of the missionary enterprise. The true character of Christianity is weakened and blurred unless it rejects all 'other gods,' and proclaims 'the absolute monarchy of the one Living God' as revealed in Jesus Christ, and His Lordship over all men.

It means that the ultimate outlook for missions is conditioned by the theological and religious temperature of the Church. Dr. Dale remarked on this point in speaking to a gathering of ministers in 1867: 'If you have any doubts as to whether it is an obligation to send the Gospel to the heathen, you ought to doubt whether it is your duty to preach it to the people of your own country, and you ought to leave your pulpits until that question is settled. It is impossible to believe in the Gospel for yourselves with a whole heart without preaching it to the whole of the human race. Included in the same act of faith—implicated necessarily in that—with which I repose in Christ as my Saviour, there is the recognition of Him as the Saviour of mankind the whole world over.'

III.

The missionary passion of a local church is always a good test of its inner religious life, for somewhere in that life and experience there must be a deep hold on the big, fundamental facts of the gospel. Out of this inner life there has issued for generations offers of life service abroad. These do not diminish radically in quantity, although there are always posts which seem to wait a long time for the right occupant. The flow of missionary candidates continues in spite of non-lucrative appointments, long years of service, and meagre prospects in retirement. It is a remarkable fact that for a hundred and fifty years the churches of Britain

have supplied the personnel which the missionary enterprise has demanded, and there are no signs of that response discontinuing. There has been nothing like it since the days of the Crusades.

'The greatest gift that the Home Churches can give to the mission field is not money, but men,' writes the secretary of one society, 'as long as there is a missionary enterprise, a foremost place must be given to the finding, training, and sending out of the men and women who are to serve Christ abroad. No committee in the whole Christian Church has a more important or far-reaching task than that which has to select candidates for the mission field. There may be money in abundance and policy of the wisest kind, but unless there are candidates of the right calibre and character the enterprise will fail.'

The sense of missionary vocation, however, needs to be stronger to-day than previously. The modern missionary is no longer the servant only of his mission. He has to work with and guide the growing Church. Sometimes he will not be quite sure what his own position is, betwixt mission and church, but only that all the tact and patience of which he is capable are needed. He must, in the words of a former missionary statesman, be prepared 'to lead from behind.' This calls for the rarest gifts in spirit and capacity from those who find their early nurture in the 'home churches.' For it truly is a day of creation in the mission field, and also a day of testing for the manhood and character of those who go out to it from the West.

IV.

What, then, of finance? For twenty years most of the great societies have been fighting hard financial battles with recurring setbacks and periodical bursts of energy by which critical situations have been triumphantly met. We have seen the churches growing poorer and the wealthier generation of givers to missions dying off. Yet those most experienced say that the resources of Christian people are still adequate to maintain—and even advance—the missionary enterprise, provided there is the willingness to do so. There is always, it must be remembered, a generation at home waiting to be won to the support of the missionary enterprise, and most societies are broader based now in popular interest and support than they were fifty years ago.

What effect will the war have on missionary giving? Many fear the worst. One great society has already been forced to cut its work by £40,000 a year, and others have instituted 'cuts' and prepared for retrenchment. Historical parallels are dangerous, but it is as well to realize that modern missions began during the Revolutionary-Napoleonic Wars, and that this great evangelical effort was born under the cloud of war. That, at least, is a fact of history, and it may be one of challenge.

It is not, however, the immediate effect of the present war, with its yet unknown burdens of taxation and increased costs of living, which will affect the missionary enterprise. We shall have to face a general impoverishment of the whole community in which the Christian churches will share. There may be revolutionary changes in our social structure which will permanently affect the ability of our people to give in the same manner as previously.

One big change has been going on for some time, and it will probably be speeded up by the changes of a prolonged war period. Money, to put it bluntly, is now more widely distributed and is often in the hands of those who have not been trained in Christian stewardship, and do not give of their substance except when stirred by a secular or humanitarian appeal. It is true, in many places, that resources in money are no longer within the Christian churches, but it is not entirely true. The ability to give is more widespread, even amongst Christian people, than in the great era of nineteenth-century missionary expansion, but a personal conscience about possessions is not so active.

It is clear that financial assistance from the West will be needed by the 'younger churches' for many generations to come. They are struggling, rather painfully, with early growing pains, and this stage is not so entrancing or appealing as the days of missionary pioneering, but it needs more disciplined financial care. Missions need intelligent financial help from people who are prepared to see far ahead and are ready to 'invest' their gifts for the long-

range building of the whole Church. And the keys to this successful finance are education in Christian stewardship, and education in the fact and fellowship of the World Church. Again a great deal of this burden rests on the ministry.

V.

While the work abroad looks to the home churches for leadership and support, it must not be forgotten that the home churches owe an enormous debt to missions. They would be poor to the point of spiritual destitution without them. They would cease to be churches at all. This fact must always be taken into account in any estimate of the outlook for missions. They help to preserve the soul of the home churches, and save it from narrow, selfish concerns. The power of prayer is always active where there is a deep concern for missions and a true catholic spirit is stimulated. The heroic element of missions, too, is a tonic for many home churches. They help to maintain the evangelistic urge at home, and are a reminder of non-Christian Britain. From missions, too, comes the call to unity, and the fresh thinking of the 'younger churches' provides an exercise ground for the intellectual life of the whole Church. For generations missions have offered avenues of selfless service to thousands of men and women, and they have been responsible for calling forth a Christian dedication of possessions which is unequalled in regularity and devotion. And they are rooted always in the abiding certainties of the Christian faith.

These are some of the debts which we at home owe to the missionary enterprise. We must reckon them amongst our precious assets in war time. For we have a unique opportunity now of confronting ourselves with the fact of the World Church and of our place in it. Many Christian people are unhappy and disillusioned about the Christian witness of the past twenty-five years and its results. There is already a turning to new doctrines and new political 'blue-prints' of world-order.

Let us not be afraid now of trumpeting and announcing the fact of the World Church as an achievement in contemporary history more potent to-day than it was twenty-five years ago, but facing in Europe and the Far East many fearful odds.

The Church has been bullied and hectored for twenty-five years for not speaking more loudly and unitedly, and for not acting more decisively. I venture to suggest that, when the tale of those years is adequately told, it will be discovered that the Christian Church went on steadily with its God-appointed task of building His Church. It was not drawn aside by 'every wind of doctrine and the sleight of men,' but saw to it that His Name was made known to all nations under heaven. It is, I believe, a salutary war-time exercise for the weary, saddened churches of Britain to look at their part in this vast enterprise and take fresh heart.

Literature.

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE.

This is the title of a remarkable book published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark at 12s. 6d. net. It is a remarkable book because of the comprehensiveness of its contents and the quality of its authorship. The aim of the editor, Professor T. W. Manson, D.Litt., D.D., is to help students of the Bible to a fuller and deeper understanding of the Biblical revelation in its historical setting. These two objectives have determined the plan of the book in all its parts. You must know the historical setting, the background, the medium in which and through which the truth came. As a matter of historical fact, the revelation came within the framework of the History of Israel. And therefore you must know about the Biblical languages, about criticism (higher and lower) and its results, about literary movements like apocalyptic, about the way in which the Old Testament grew and the New Testament was made. You must know the geographical and the archæological background. You must have a very thorough treatment of the history of Israel.

And then you come to the religion of the Bible

itself. It is a good thing to see the pit out of which it was dug, and how it was purified and developed and inspired by the Spirit of God until God brought Jesus. And now you come to something momentous, the Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ, and the story of His apostles and their doctrine. These subjects must be in good hands. And if the book is very thorough it must give you something about the Jewish background to the Christian story, the Priesthood, the Scribes, and the Synagogue.

A very large order? Very. Well, it is all here in this great book. But the planning is not very much if the builders are not good enough. And one of the most remarkable things about this book is the team of builders Dr. Manson has gathered about him. Here are some of them: Professor W. F. Howard, Professor Oesterley, Professor W. M. Calder (on Asia Minor), Dr. J. W. Jack (on Biblical Archæology, of course, the subject he has made his own), Professor T. H. Robinson (on the History of Israel, naturally), Professor Wheeler Robinson (on the Religion of Israel, just as naturally), Professor C. H. Dodd (on the Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ, and on the History and Doctrine of the Apostolic Age), Rabbi Rabinowitz (on the Scribes and the Law), and Bishop Hunkin (on the Organization and Worship of the Primitive Church).

We simply had to give these names (and there are others) to show not only the quality of the writers but also that of the editor who chose them. The least we can say of this book is that the reader has in it the conclusions of the foremost experts in every branch of Biblical learning. It is a fascinating book, both on account of its subjects and on account of the way they are handled. No one need be afraid of it. The editor's first words in introducing it are these. The conviction dominating it is that 'the primary and vital interest of the Bible is that it records the authentic word of God—His gracious revelation of Himself in terms of personality and life in the midst of the life of man.' We should say that this is a reassuring book. But it is also what its title implies, one that will send you to the Bible itself, that will make the Bible both interesting (and how much that is) and authoritative.

It would be invidious to single out any one piece of work as superior to others. Every reader will choose what appeals to him most. But perhaps it may be allowable to express special appreciation of the work of the editor himself, both in his vigorous and original introduction and in his section on the New Testament literature. And a word should certainly be said in praise of the enterprise of the publishers in issuing such a book at such a time. We hope their courage will be rewarded by a large sale. It may be added that the book has an attractive form, both in print and binding.

THE TELL EL-AMARNA TABLETS.

We have at last an English translation of these famous clay tablets, which consist of over three hundred diplomatic despatches and letters in the Akkadian language, sent by Palestinian and Babylonian kings and rulers to the Egyptian Pharaohs, *c.* 1400–1366 B.C. They were unearthed in Egypt in 1887 from the archives in the ruins of Ikhnaton's palace, and were translated into German a few years later by the Norwegian scholar, Dr. J. A. Knudtzon. A new publication of them has long been desired by Semitic scholars, not only because other tablets belonging to the same group have come to light since Knudtzon completed his task in 1914 (no less than eighteen have been discovered within the last ten years), but a vast amount of new information is now available owing to archæological research in Palestine within recent years. We have only to think of what we know now regarding the Sagaz, Sûtû, Ḫabiru, Hurrians, Ras Shamra, etc., and it is evident that scholars can give a much more reliable commentary on the Letters. The fact may also be added that a new and clearer facsimile of the original cuneiform on most of the tablets (those in the Berlin Museum) is now in existence, leading to innumerable improvements in Knudtzon's text, and the further fact that those tablets in the Hurrian (or other) language have now been translated, to some extent at least, by scholars such as F. Bork and J. Friedrich. For such reasons Old Testament students everywhere will welcome this new translation and commentary in English, *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets*, edited by Samuel A. B. Mercer, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Egyptology in the University of Toronto, with the assistance of Professor F. H. Hallock in the final revision of the manuscript (Macmillan; 2 vols., £4. 4s. net). No more competent scholar could have undertaken this important labour than Dr. Mercer, the author of nearly two dozen published brochures on Egyptian and Near Eastern questions. It hardly needs to be said that these admirable volumes of transliteration, translation, and commentary form almost as perfect a work as it is possible to produce. Knudtzon's conclusions, where universally accepted, have not been repeated, and thus his *magnum opus* is still necessary for technical students; but wherever they are affected by our newer knowledge, the commentary takes note of the fact.

The Letters bristle with difficulties of interpretation and raise numerous historical problems, but the second volume contains most helpful explanatory 'Excursuses' on Babylonia, Assyria, Mitanni, Alašia, the Hittites, Gubla, the Ḫabiru, the Hurrians, and Egypt. The Letters deal chiefly with the invasion of Canaan by the Ḫabiru-Sagaz people (*c.* 1400 B.C.), which has been identified by numerous outstanding scholars with the Hebrew Conquest. There is no need to enter into this problem here, except to say that the Excursus—a most comprehensive one—on the question recognizes a close connexion, practically amounting to identification, between Ḫabiru and Hebrews. The view expressed at the close, though with some amount of uncertainty, is that the word Ḫabiru represents the Hebrew race, of whom the Israelites formed only a part. This aspect, now generally accepted, is probably the correct one, otherwise we are faced with insuperable historical difficulties, and no name occurs for the widespread Hebrew race either in Palestinian, or Babylonian, or Hittite or other records—a most remarkable fact, to say the least.

Most scholars will agree with Professor Mercer that Ikhnaton's religion was not Monotheism, that the name Mitanni should rather be Mitannu (the nominative), that Shanḫar is not the Biblical Shinar (which is undoubtedly Babylonia) but some district in North Syria, and as a rule that his views of personal and geographical names are in accord with modern research. But some critics will differ from him on a few points. Labaia, for instance, may not be a Hurrian or Mitannian name, but according to excellent authorities is another form of Levi (cf. Lebbaeus, Mt 10^3 and Nestorian Labbaj); Ginti-Kirmil (p. 715) is certainly not Mt. Carmel but the Gath-Carmel of Judah, now the ruined *Kurmul*, about ten miles south-east of Hebron; Zilû (p. 716) cannot be Sellê, just east of Ḳanṭarah, which was a frontier fort of Egypt, but must have been some place near Lachish; the ideogram Sagaz (p. 764) was probably not pronounced Ḫabiru but *ḫab(b)atu*, 'fighting man,' 'plunderer,' and can only be taken as equivalent to Ḫabiru in the sense that these people belonged generally to the Hebrew race; the 'mighty king,' through whom Abdi-Ashirta became powerful, was not the Egyptian one (as stated p. 833), but the Hittite one; Dr. Jack does not represent the Sagaz as 'Hittite mercenaries' (p. 844), but as kinsmen of the Israelites entering Palestine from the north-east, largely under Abdi-Ashirta; and there is surely no reason in Abdi-Ḫiba's Letters for translating this ruler's city sometimes as 'Urusalim' and at other times as 'Jerusalem.'

But this mild criticism is of little consequence compared with the high scholarship manifest on every page of these volumes. Professor Mercer has an excellent command of all the relevant literature, and is to be congratulated on a valuable piece of work, which also brings great credit to the Canadian Church. The volumes will be welcomed with much interest and gratitude by Egyptologists, Old Testament scholars, and Near Eastern students in every land, and will be accepted, we feel sure, as the final word on the subject.

GOD AND OUR SOULS.

The Love of God (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net) is described by its author, Dom Aelfred Graham, Monk of Ampleforth Abbey, as an 'Essay in Analysis.' It seeks to analyse man's love for God, in its larger and more general aspects, in a way that is acceptable to critical and thinking minds. The author makes no special claim to religious experience, such as the saint or the mystic might well make. He does not profess to be a master of the spiritual life. He recalls the distinction, as old as Aristotle, between the man who knows a science empirically and one who has some theoretical acquaintance with its underlying principles; and it is only the last that he professes to be. Let us say at once, and briefly, that his claim is well founded.

The scope of the work is large and varied, as might be expected of an author who has nourished his mind on St. Thomas Aquinas. If the general background against which the work is set is revealed truth, 'the glass, so to say, through which revelation has been viewed is that provided by the immortal *Summa Theologica*.' This also accounts for the intellectual consistency of the work, a quality which is of high importance to the author's mind, and for which his readers will be grateful to him. And here we remark that his readers might well include others than the theological and the religious; for he has succeeded in his aim of providing a treatment of the spiritual life which is 'profound without being technical, inspiring without labouring the moral.'

It must suffice to indicate the 'analytical contents' of the book. First comes a treatment of the nature of man's love of God, including a consideration of God, man, and the love that unites them. Then are set forth the conditions of the love of God, under the three headings of knowledge, drawing near to God, and unworldliness (under this last heading subjects like temperance, abstinence, and human affections are discussed). Then the

expression of the love of God is considered, in prayer, self-abnegation, and action. Finally, the effects of the love of God are analysed, the three headings in this case being the Presence, Union, and the Mind of Christ. In this section of the book the Eucharist and the mystic claim fall to be treated, and the concluding thought is that without a return to 'the mind of Christ' there is little hope for the world in which we live.

WAR-TIME DEVOTIONS.

As was natural and inevitable a full stream of devotional literature has been brought into being by the war. Most of the books are small in size, but they contain material which may be useful both for private and for public prayer. *A War Primer, containing Prayers Old and New, for Public and Private Use in Time of War,* has been compiled by the Rev. F. B. Macnutt, Canon of Canterbury. The title was a familiar one in Mediæval and Reformation periods, when 'Primers' were the lay-folks' handbook of private prayers. This book, published by the S.P.C.K. at 3s. 6d. net, consists of three parts. Part I. includes the prayers officially issued for use on the day of National Prayer, 1st October, 1939, and others similarly provided during the war of 1914–1918. Part II. includes Intercessions, and Part III. contains prayers of a more general kind for private devotion. All the prayers are of Collect length, though not always of Collect structure. They have been selected from all sorts of sources, ancient and modern, classical and informal; and they will provide just what the compiler offers, personal inspiration and help in the conduct of public worship.

Martha's Prayer Book (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net), by E. F. H., is not, as one would gather, a book of prayers but a book to help us to give prayer a true place in our lives. It is 'Martha's' because it is meant for busy people, the mother in the home, the business girl, the domestic worker. Such people often think that much prayer is not possible for them. This little book will help them to realize that their whole life may be a prayer, and the lifting up of the heart to God can fill their lives with new meaning. That is its purpose. It deals with the Practice of the Presence of God, and has much good advice to give on the possibilities of prayer-life.

Venite: A Book of Worship for Schools (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net) is issued with the commendation of the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Wales, and the Primus of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. It has been drawn up by a Committee of the National Society, the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education, as a result of their contact and conference with schools of various kinds. Its main purpose is to teach boys and girls how to worship, and to this end a service has been constructed. The principles on which the service has been based are educationally sound, and the book, though small, contains as well as the service, many acts of devotion that are both simple and uplifting.

Prayers at the Eucharist in the Words of Holy Scripture (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net) is a beautiful little book, outwardly and inwardly. It was originally published in 1900 and then went out of print. The attention of the Society was called to it by some one who had used it for thirty years and found it incomparably the best in his knowledge. And so it has been re-issued, to the great advantage of many, we hope. The original compilation was made by the Sisters of the Community of St. Peter, and their selection of Scripture words for the preparation of the communicant has been made with profound insight. This is a book that will be found searching and edifying by Christians of all churches.

The Certainties of Faith, Hope, and Love: Devotional Studies for War Time (Allenson; 6d. net), by the Rev. J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., who has already published a book of 'Prayers for Every Day,' gives us a series of five 'devotional studies,' with readings and prayers. The meditations are appropriate and devout, and the prayers are well chosen and helpful. It is a modest publication, but the reader will find much in it to cheer him and strengthen his faith in these troublous days.

Albert Schweitzer is a man of many parts, doctor of philosophy, of theology, of medicine, of music. Now he appears in the guise of a raconteur with a keen sense of humour. *From My African Notebook* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net) has been translated by Mrs. C. E. B. Russell. It contains a series of stories loosely strung together which the writer has accumulated in the course of his missionary and hospital work. Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that which deals with taboos and magic, but the whole book is a storehouse of anecdotes grave and gay, tragic and humorous, illustrating the practices and mentality of the African.

The Real and the Negative (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net) comes from the pen of an Indian thinker,

Mr. B. K. Mallik, M.A., who has spent a good number of years at Oxford, and has been in intimate contact with distinguished thinkers like Dr. R. R. Marett, Professor C. C. J. Webb, and Professor S. Radhakrishnan. His book, which has occupied him for nearly two decades, is an account of the universe based on pure logic, having no alignment with esoteric, poetic, or scientific assumptions. He makes a large claim for the system of thought here presented. Its logic he regards as unimpeachable, and its conclusions as the only solution of the impasse centuries of human history have reached. It is indeed a startling claim, but we must leave the logicians to deal with it. All we add is that while the book abounds in learning and eloquence, it is hard to understand as a whole and often in its parts. The impression remains with us that here is a philosopher of an Eastern habit of mind who has difficulty in subduing Western forms to his ways of thought.

It is natural that preachers should be curious to know how other men preach, and accordingly they are said to be the best buyers of volumes of sermons. Outlines of sermons, however, are apt to give the impression of valleys of dry bones, impossible to clothe with flesh and blood or breathe the breath of life into. But we must make an exception in favour of the volume before us—*A Living Faith*, by the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net). It has two excellences. The outlines are sufficiently full to be readable and interesting. Better still they are arranged in orderly groups under such general headings as God and Man, Religion and Life, Deliverance from Fear, Family Life and Religion, A Christian Order of Society, The Church's Seasons. In each group there are four or five outlines which suggest the material for a short course of sermons. The element of instruction predominates, and preachers will find in them real help.

A Complete Index to the Thought and Teachings of Christ, by Mr. W. S. Harris (James Clarke; 5s. net), is a marvel of industry and patience. The bulk of the book is occupied with what amounts to a complete concordance of the words and works of Jesus. A rough estimate indicates that under a hundred and fifty headings arranged in alphabetical order there must be five to six thousand references. 'References are grouped by subject with necessary sub-headings and explanatory phrases to insure finding a desired passage with minimum effort.' At the end of the book there are lists of miracles, parables, and prayers of Jesus, with names and titles given to Christ in Scripture. There is also a chronological survey of the events of His earthly life. The book should prove a help to the busy preacher and teacher.

The Conflict of the Cross, by the Rev. O. E. Burton, M.A. (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), aims at setting forth the cosmic significance of the Cross as the culmination of God's self-revelation to the world. The writer plunges at once into deep waters when he proceeds in the opening chapter to deal with the Being and Nature of God. We do not feel that he has any special qualifications for handling so profound a theme, and some of his statements, though orthodox in intention, are very open to criticism. He is more at home when he comes to speak of the grace of God in Christ Jesus and of the new life in Him. Here his warmth of feeling and devotional fervour have full scope, and he writes most persuasively. The whole character of his thought is closely scriptural and his treatment throughout is very refreshing to read.

The *Hebrew Union College Annual* for 1939 (Hebrew Union College; Cincinnati; $3.00) well maintains the high standard set by its predecessors, and is marked by the breadth of outlook and depth of scholarship which we have learned to associate with it. To discuss its sixteen articles in detail is impossible, especially as some of them are fairly long. The subjects handled include new MS discoveries, some of them very important, ancient Hebrew music, the history of the Jews, not only in ancient but also in modern times, grammar, exegesis, and philosophy. Much of this will be entirely fresh to the average reader; the account of Gabirol's metaphysics given by Heschel, for instance, and Idelsohn's article on the Mogen-Ovos Mode suggest to some of us realms of knowledge which we have never explored. Sperber has continued his studies in Hebrew grammar with an article entitled 'Hebrew based on Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission.' This, however, is of less interest than his work, published in the 1938 volume, on Hebrew grammar as illustrated from Greek and other transliterations, and will be of value to the textual critic rather than to the philologist. There are two admirable articles by Julius Lewy, one on the Feast of Purim, and one on the relation of the Ḫabiru to the Hebrews. Cronbach continues his studies in the Me'il Zedakah, and Englander his discussion of Rashi's views on grammar. Many readers will find that for them one

article stands out above the rest; this is Morgenstren's discussion of the mythological background of Ps 82. It deals with more than the Psalm in question, and is an able and convincing treatment of the whole theme of the rebel angels as they appear in Gn 6^{1-4}, 1 Enoch 6–16, and elsewhere. The article occupies nearly a hundred pages, and is almost a book in itself. But to single out this particular contribution is not to cast any slur on the work of other writers in the volume; it is simply to indicate that though all are good we have here a valuable and permanent contribution to our study of the Old Testament. The volume is worth having, if for this article alone.

The Rev. Nathaniel Micklem, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, has written an 'open letter' to his fellow-Christians under the title, *May God Defend the Right* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is a topical work, written since the declaration of war against Germany, and written too in a simple, straightforward, unpretentious style. His aim is to explain, both to his fellow-Christians and to others who would understand us, 'how we hold in tension within our hearts the two convictions, seemingly so contradictory, "all war is defiance of the will of God" and "this war is the will of God".' Obviously it is a 'non-pacifist' pronouncement. Dr. Micklem is convinced that we ought to fight against Nazism, to which the phrase 'Antichrist' may be genuinely applied, even though it means fighting against God's will. In view of the dilemma thus set up he recalls the theological distinction between the antecedent and the consequent will of God. It is against God's will that men and nations should fight with each other, but it may sometimes be that to fight is the only way to vindicate the high principles which God looks to us to vindicate. Dr. Micklem is in close touch with Germany, and in particular with Protestant Church circles in Germany, and this adds greatly to the value and interest of his book.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead has the ear of a large public, and many of his readers will be glad to hear him *Thinking Aloud in War-Time* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). The writer has a useful gift for a preacher. He knows pretty well what the average man is thinking and he is able to think with him. Three of his subjects in this book are just the subjects multitudes are turning over in their minds at present. Can a Christian take part in war? Can we pray about war? Can God vindicate Himself? It is good to face such questions, and have it out with our own faith. And Mr. Weatherhead has much to say on these and other matters that is worth saying and worth hearing.

The Catholic Christ is a beautiful book, without and within. It is written by the late Rev. A. E. Whitham (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The book is described on the jacket as 'a devotional book, specially suited to Lenten reading.' Well, it is that. It is suited to any other season also. But it must not be supposed that the book is stronger on the emotional side than on the intellectual. It is full of strenuous thinking. It is garnished by many quotations from a wide culture. It has a delicate style. But it is above all uplifting. In this sense it is devotional. The chapter, 'Not for High-brows' is sheer poetry, but poetry with strength as well as tenderness. The writer has a gift for phrases. Witness what he says of the work of God. It is the work of God to take the taste of sin out of our mouth. We have been deeply impressed by this devout and illuminating book.

The late Bishop of London issued for sixteen years a notable series of 'Lenten Books.' His successor in office has resolved to continue the practice and has entrusted the task for this year to the Dean of St. Paul's. No choice could have been better, and the result is a very fine little book—*Following Christ*, by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.Lit., D.D. (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Its title sufficiently indicates its contents, and the treatment is most fresh and thought-provoking. Christian discipleship is portrayed as something robust and heroic, with vital consequences in individual and social life, and possible only through the grace of God. Finally, if any should be disposed to wonder whether it is any use to follow Christ, 'let us remember the obvious truth that the present crisis is a large-scale demonstration of the folly of not following Christ. . . . As we cower in our dug-outs we may have leisure to reflect on the blessings of a scientific civilization which has forgotten God, and we may reflect too that only in the following of Christ, not in the letter but in the spirit, is there any hope for the rebuilding of the shattered world.'

To that excellent little 'Needs of To-day' Series, Principal Lindsay Dewar has contributed a useful book on *Learning to Think* (Rich & Cowan; 3s. 6d. net). It is written in a popular style, and gives some very helpful lessons in logic and psychology. Technical terminology is avoided, and the general

reader is instructed in understandable language what fallacies in reasoning he must guard against and how he must learn to concentrate and develop his thinking powers. If the hints here given were taken to heart there would be much less inaccurate thinking and unsound argumentation.

Professor Fleming James, whose 'Thirty Psalmists' called for such warm approval, has followed up his work with another book, *Personalities of the Old Testament* (Scribner's; 12s. 6d. net), in which he has set himself a much more difficult task. His aim is to study the great characters revealed in the Old Testament, and he has tried to cover practically the whole field of the Old Testament, omitting only the Psalter. Some of the people he describes are known to us through historical records; others, many of them anonymous, have left their stamp on the literature of the Bible. Thus Professor James includes 'J,' 'E,' the Deuteronomists, and the author of Job, as well as outstanding figures like Deborah, David, and Isaiah. His method is to give an account of the records referring to, or left by, each individual, and then to form an estimate of the character and influence of the man or woman in question. In some cases a good deal of literary and historical criticism is necessarily involved, and here the author shows himself sane and judicious, with occasional conservative tendencies. A practical monotheism, for example, is ascribed to Moses and Elijah (the two are skilfully compared one with another) and the full doctrine to Amos. In general, the extent to which Professor James has succeeded will be variously appraised by different readers. In some cases the available evidence is scanty or unreliable, and he has been compelled to draw on his stores of sympathetic imagination. For this he cannot be condemned, even by those who differ from him, and he has given us a stimulating work which, to some extent, serves the purposes both of an introduction to and a religious history of Israel, and shows real insight into the great personalities whom he has tried to interpret for us.

The Rising Waters, by the Rev. Eric S. Loveday, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net), is commended in a Preface by the Bishop of Bristol. It is intended for Lenten meditation and deals in a special sense with the 'deepening' of the spiritual life. The writer bases his meditation on Ezekiel's vision of the stream which flowed from the Temple and deepened as it flowed. He gives to this vision a somewhat unusual significance taking the successive stages of the deepening water as symbolic of the beginnings of the Christian life, prayer, service, and the fullness of spiritual experience. This may be counted fanciful, but as the Bishop says, 'the book is written in a style that is unconventional, alive, and challenging.' Better still, it is full of sound doctrine which will edify the reader.

Profitable Bible Study, by the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D. (Wilde & Co., Boston; $1.50), is meant to help the Bible student to read his Bible intelligently and profitably. To this end suggestions are made about methods of study. About ninety pages are given to this, and then about a hundred pages are devoted to an annotated list of 'the first one hundred best books for the Bible student's library.' All the questions a simple Bible reader will ask are answered here, and helpfully. But the most interesting part of the book is the list of literature, *and* the annotations. Dr. Smith is very 'sound,' and when he mentions any modernist book, or one tinged with modernity, 'the reader is warned.' Most of the books cited are quite unknown here, and there is a lack of discrimination in the valuation of literature. Some of the works recommended are out of date. But many good books are mentioned, and on the whole the hard work Dr. Smith has put into this guide will be found of practical assistance.

The Bible throughout the World: A Survey of Scriptural Translations, by the Rev. R. Kilgour, D.D. (World Dominion Press; 5s. net), is a volume of the World Dominion Survey Series. It is a monument of industry and research. It has 'been prepared for the practical purpose of supplying information on the extent of Scripture translation, recording briefly what has been done, and, by inference, suggesting what remains to be accomplished.' The writer, whose competence for this great task cannot be questioned, has chosen to arrange his material geographically. Accordingly we have chapters on the Bible through Europe, Africa, Asia, America, and the Pacific Islands. As far as we have been able to check the work, it seems to be very accurate and complete. For missionaries and intending translators it should be of great service as a book of reference. Inevitably the vast amount of material to be handled has necessitated such compression that there is little room left for the picturesque or romantic. The hidden romance behind it all must be left to the imagination of the reader. It is of general interest to know that 'if they were able to read, at least nine-tenths of mankind are now supplied with some portion of God's Word in a tongue they could understand.'

Constructive Theology.

VI. Sanctification.

By the Reverend George S. Hendry, B.D., Bridge of Allan.

The difficulty of isolating the subject on which he has chosen to write is probably more acute for the present writer than for any other contributor to this series of articles. Sanctification is so intimately bound up with other doctrines that it is almost impossible to treat it adequately by itself. In the majority of theological works it is treated more or less closely in conjunction with justification. I do not know of a single book which deals with it exclusively.

This difficulty is recognized by every theologian. But there is a marked contrast between the theological view and the current popular view of the matter. The average, ordinary person, who is not versed in theology, regards sanctification as the sum and substance of religion—as he himself would express it, the business of religion is to make better men and women. Sanctification is to him the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*. If religion fulfils his requirement, he approves it and admires it, even though he may not himself profess to be religious; if he sees the fruits of religion manifest in 'changed lives,' he is willing to acknowledge that the tree is good; but where these fruits are not conspicuously present, modern man is disposed to be critical of religion or indifferent towards it.

We need have no quarrel with the popular estimate of the central importance of sanctification; for we find it endorsed by the New Testament: we read there, 'This is the will of God, even your sanctification' (1 Th 4^{3}), and we are told that the whole paraphernalia of religion, as the modern man might call it, has been instituted for this express purpose, that we should 'all come . . . unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph 4^{11-13}). It may be said to be the view of the New Testament itself that the business of religion is to make us better men and women. The trouble arises only when the modern exponent of this view goes on to affirm dogmatically, as he often does, that this is the sole and sufficient content of religion. For sanctification, though it is so strongly emphasized in the New Testament, never bears the sole emphasis; it is inseparably bound up with other things, especially with justification. And these other things are no mere logical presuppositions; they point to the fact that the change which it is the business of religion to effect in the lives of men and women is a larger and more-sided affair than can be expressed in a single term. Each of the terms employed presents only a fragment or aspect of the whole, and the others form its indispensable complement; it is impossible to obtain a full view of any one of them unless it is studied in conjunction with the others.

I.

The revelation of God in Christ, with which all the doctrines of Christian theology are concerned, is not merely the disclosure of truth which man may apprehend, but the truth itself impinges upon man and penetrates to the core of his life. It is like an inverted cone: the apex forms the point of impact upon man; all the lines in the cone converge towards this point, and upon it the whole weight of the cone rests. No single doctrine of theology can be rightly understood so long as it is left remaining in the air, but only when the line is traced which leads to this decisive point.

It is what takes place at this point that forms the subject-matter of that chapter of dogmatics which is traditionally entitled, 'The Grace of the Holy Spirit.' For purposes of dogmatic study this is divided up under a number of heads which have been variously arranged in a much debated *ordo salutis*. A familiar arrangement is the triad of the Westminster Confession—justification, adoption, and sanctification; but the list may be considerably expanded.

A preliminary definition of sanctification is provided by the etymology of the word: it means 'making holy,' and holy may be broadly defined as pertaining to God or the divine sphere. Thus sanctification means making man fit for God or for the presence of God. We may proceed to a further statement of it by way of seeking the answers to two questions, What does it involve? and How is it done?

II.

Sanctification has been defined as the renewal or restoration of man in the image of God. The precise meaning of this term in Gn 1^{26} is a matter on which some uncertainty exists; but its employment in the definition of sanctification has the initial value of indicating that Christian theology has a definite view of man, the ethical subject, and that the end in view is not the transformation of man into some more or less impossible ideal, but his restoration to his true and original self. Christian theology is distinguished from all schools of ethical thought by the fact that it learns the true nature of man in divine revelation, while for them it is always more or less a riddle, to which they can offer only partial and speculative solutions. They may indeed be not without some element or aspect of the truth, but none of them can apprehend the whole truth; for the whole truth of man is such that it can only be disclosed in divine revelation. The consequence is that, in attempting to present a complete view of man without revelation, philosophical ethics invariably does violence to his nature—and this may account for the fact, which has been remarked, that Christian ethics has a closer affinity with common sense than philosophical ethics, which common sense tends to regard with impatience and suspicion.

The truth concerning man, which is revealed in the Word of God, is that man is made in the image of God. The meaning of this term is to be sought, not so much in Gn 1^{26}, where its sense is admittedly doubtful, as rather in the New Testament, *e.g.* Col 3^{10}, where the restoration of man in the image of his Creator is stated as the end of sanctification. The natural suggestion of the phrase is that man is a duplicate or replica of God, and this, according to Old Testament scholars, is probably the sense it bears in the original document of the Creation narrative (though it can scarcely have been so understood by the compiler of Genesis; for according to Gn 3^{5} it is precisely the desire to 'be as gods' which is the cause of man's sin). This interpretation has played a large part in the history of Christian thought; it forms the basis of all the theories that some faculty or part of man, greater or less in extent, is divine and represents a fragment or vestige of the image of God, which he has retained, while the remainder was effaced or destroyed. It has been convincingly argued by Brunner in several of his recent books that the phrase cannot bear this interpretation; it cannot bear it in the New Testament, and indeed, there is nothing in the Old Testament that accords with it. A survey of the New Testament teaching on man would seem to show that the phrase is just a synonym for the more familiar concept of divine sonship; compare Col 3^{10} 'put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him' with Jn 1^{12} 'As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.' The only merit of the phrase is that it makes prominent a certain feature or element of divine sonship which might otherwise be overlooked. It emphasizes the truth that the essential fact about man is his relation to God; it is not an accident that is added subsequently, as it were, to man's life, but it is itself the essence of man. Man is so made that he cannot be himself by himself, he cannot be his true self except within this relation to God. As the image cannot subsist save as the reflection of the original, so man made in the image of God is a creature who can exist only in correspondence with his Creator—or, as Brunner has expressed it, his is a being-in-responsibility. The fundamental sin of man consists in his misunderstanding of himself as an independent, self-sufficient being who can stand upon his own feet. This is the meaning of 'original sin': it is the presumption of the image to isolate itself from the original and be itself by itself. The truth of man is that he cannot be himself without God any more than a husband can be a husband without a wife—the analogy employed by Paul to describe the relation between Christ and the Church of the sanctified.

If this were consistently borne in mind, it would help to remove many difficulties which have been a fruitful source of theological dispute. The whole discussion of the question whether man lost the divine image in whole or in part is seen to be irrelevant when it is realized that the divine image is not something that man ever possessed within himself, so that its loss could be attested by some deformation of his nature, the loss of some faculty or the like. Such deformation doubtless accompanies it, but fundamentally it means the severing of man's relation with God. Sin can never be discovered by even the acutest analysis of man, since its essential reference is to man's 'Original'; it is his deviation from the pattern to which his life belongs, the pattern of his relations to God and to his neighbour.

There is probably no term in Christian preaching which falls on more uncomprehending ears to-day than 'sin.' When he hears the Church declare that all men are sinners, the average citizen, who is a decent and well-intentioned individual, feels bewildered or even repelled; the words convey no meaning to him, he is conscious of no sense of sin. But this is precisely the best evidence of his sin; for this misunderstanding, or this failure to understand at all, is due to the age-old infection of our thinking, including our religious thinking, with the individualistic presupposition. The most urgent task of a constructive theology at the present time is to rid itself of this individualistic fallacy (which itself belongs to the deceitfulness of sin) and reconstruct itself upon what may be called a 'relational' basis.[1] No Christian doctrine can be satisfactorily stated in terms of the individual. The attempt to do so leads to insoluble antinomies and barren logomachies, as witness the endless discussions of the question of general and special revelation.

III.

After this lengthy preface we may proceed to state the essential meaning of sanctification very briefly. Sanctification is the restoration of man in the image of God, *i.e.*, the restoration of man to his true self, to the true pattern of human life. That pattern, if we may employ a geometrical figure, is triangular: the three points are God, myself, and my neighbour; and the meaning is that I can only be myself when I occupy my place in this triangle and the lines are drawn that bind me to God and to my neighbour. Just as sin is the will-to-independence by which man breaks out of this triangle and attempts to live his life as a sovereign individual, a kind of mathematical point, which has position, but, alas, no magnitude, so sanctification is essentially the return of man from the exile of this individualism and his incorporation in the triangle of relations to God and to his neighbour to which his life belongs. To speak concretely, it is his incorporation into the Church, the body of Christ; for the Church consists of those who renounce their selfhood, their separateness, are baptised into Christ, and 'co-inhere' in Him.

In a recent book Mr. Charles Williams pleads eloquently for a new apprehension of this principle of co-inherence as the essential meaning of sanctification, and he suggests that 'it might indeed be worth the foundation of an order within the Christian Church' (*The Descent of the Dove*, 236). Such an emphasis is certainly called for, both for the sake of the Church and for the sake of the world. The Church has too long been dominated by the individualistic conception of sainthood which is commonly associated with Roman Catholicism but which has been even more potent, albeit less explicit, in Protestantism. Sanctification has been understood to mean a transformation of the character of the individual, the acquisition by the individual of certain 'virtues' or qualities which set upon him the stamp of holiness. This misconception laid an undue burden upon the individual, and when the matter was pressed, it either lost credence or it became positively pernicious. Now it is not denied that sanctification will be marked by changes in a man's character; but these changes are not the *sine qua non* of it—the shocking scandals in the Corinthian Church did not prevent the Apostle from addressing that Church as saints (1 Co 1[2])—they derive their substance and their meaning from the new order of relations which a man enters rather than from a mysterious or magical infusion of grace into the depths of his soul. A man is not

[1] The programme of such a reorientation of theology has been admirably sketched by Brunner in his book, *Wahrheit als Begegnung* (Berlin; 1938).

sanctified in himself—that would be a contradiction in terms—but, as Paul repeatedly formulates it, we are 'sanctified in Christ Jesus,' *i.e.*, by being incorporated into that body, that order of relations, of which He is the head.

It is this emphasis too—call it the social or preferably the corporative emphasis—which is called for by the needs of mankind to-day, 'in our present distresses, of international and social schism, among the praises of separation here or there' (C. Williams, *op. cit.*). The world-crisis of our time arises from the problem of community or coherence. Mankind has lost the secret of coherence, or it has lost the power to cope with the factors of disruption which have acquired such unprecedented force in modern life. This disintegrating tendency in human society is manifest on all sides, and the violent measures that have been taken to arrest it in some quarters, the various collectivisms and dictatorships, serve only to accentuate its gravity; for they achieve their success only at the cost of amputating some essential part of man and thus making him into a caricature of himself.

It is the task of the Christian Church to exhibit the saving remedy for this dire malady of mankind. This is not to say that the Church has to proclaim a 'social gospel' in distinction from some other kind of gospel. There is no other kind of gospel: the gospel is social, and unless it is so proclaimed, it is something less than the gospel that is proclaimed. The Church has itself to be the solution of the social problem; for there is no solution of it other than the Church. There can be no true community of persons except within that triangle which is the divine pattern of human life. The kind of talk which suggests that the Church, or Christ through the Church, has something to offer to the world other than the Church itself is vain from the outset, because it proceeds from false premises. There can be no solidarity among men except where there is fellowship with God, no coherence without co-inherence. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* The Church has nothing to offer to the world, no service to render it save just to be itself and to call the world into itself. So far from offering something less than this, it has rather to offer something more—the promise of the Kingdom of God.

IV.

We come now to the second main question we have to ask regarding sanctification—How is it done? It will be well to consider this question in the light of the view of the meaning of sanctification which has been sketched. It is agreed by all that sanctification is a work of the Holy Spirit; but when it is understood in terms of the solitary individual, the problem of the relation of grace and personality immediately arises in a psychological form which admits of interminable discussion. If, however, we understand sanctification in the sense indicated in the foregoing, the problem assumes a different and a more hopeful aspect; indeed it almost becomes irrelevant. For sanctification is not a mysterious change which takes place in the interior of the individual soul, but a change of man's total situation; man is no longer himself, he is incorporated or ingrafted into Christ, he is 'translated' into the kingdom of Christ (Col 1^{13}), he partakes of 'the fellowship of the mystery' (Eph 3^{9}); indeed he ceases to be himself at all, he enters into a new identity through the self-identification of Christ with him, which is 'represented, sealed and applied' to him in baptism. This change is the gift of God, His unspeakable gift; God in Christ invades man's self-isolation and by identifying Himself with man He creates for man a new situation. He restores the pattern of co-inherence which was broken by man's sin, and in the word of reconciliation He calls man into it: 'The kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe the gospel.' To hear and answer the call of the gospel is to accept this new situation, this new identity. 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new' (2 Co 5^{17}).

It remains for man, who is thus by the gift of the gospel incorporated into Christ, to 'become what he is,' to walk in the good works unto which he is created in Christ Jesus (Eph 2^{10}). Being now in Christ, he has to put on Christ; he must put off the old man, who lives to self, and put on the new man who lives to Christ and grows up into Christ. Being actually placed in a new situation, he must accommodate himself to it and respond to its challenge. The essence of this changed situation

is that man is called back from the exile of his individual solitude, his *Icheinsamkeit*, and incorporated in that body in which he is united in reconciliation and peace with God and his neighbour. His task is now to live his life according to the pattern to which it is restored. Having received the gift of the gospel, he has now to 'obey the gospel.'

The life of sanctification has really only one characteristic—solidarity. It is the life of the Church, the life of fellowship with God and with man. Its law is the law of love—love to God and to neighbour. Its principles are mutuality and co-inherence. This is very conspicuous in the ethical exhortations in Paul's Epistles. It has sometimes been felt that there is a lack of consistency between Paul's ethics and his dogmatics; but nothing could be further from the truth: the setting of his ethics is the self-same gospel which he expounds in his dogmatics. His ethical exhortations are governed by the consideration of solidarity: 'we are members one of another' (Eph 4^{25}); the duties he teaches are simply the requirements of fellowship. Even where he is concerned with apparently more private virtues, such as chastity, there too the governing consideration is that we are the 'members of Christ' (1 Co 6^{15}).

If it is asked whether in our obedience to the restored pattern of human life we have to depend upon our own efforts or whether God gives help, the answer surely is that there could be no help more potent than the gospel itself. The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicates to us the benefits of redemption are themselves the means by which we receive the grace of new obedience; for the purpose of grace is not to enable us to develop strong and self-reliant characters and to win 'moral victories,' but to keep us in the love of God and to bind us more closely in love to one another.

Throughout this pilgrimage and warfare our obedience to the gospel remains as fragmentary and imperfect as our apprehension of it. But as the gospel is the finished work, so too our sanctification, which flows from it, has the sure promise of fulfilment. And so, 'forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus' (Ph $3^{13f.}$).

The Resurrection Narratives.

By the Reverend Francis B. Westbrook, B.A., B.Mus., Maltby, Rotherham.

I. In the 1939 February and March issues of The Expository Times there appeared two carefully reasoned articles from the pen of Professor G. H. C. Macgregor, designed to uphold the view that two traditions are to be found in the New Testament concerning our Lord's resurrection. The one is a bodily resurrection which carries with it the idea of 'reanimation,' and the other 'quite inconsistent' with the foregoing, is a spiritual resurrection, presenting the Risen Christ as 'a purely spiritual and "glorified" being.'

Is this distinction to be drawn? The purpose of this paper is to defend the traditional view and to prove that the alleged inconsistency does not exist in anything like the manner Dr. Macgregor would urge.

We are given a quotation from Peter's speech at Pentecost. 'This Jesus did God raise up' and 'hath made him both Lord and Christ' (Ac $2^{32.\ 36}$). 'This,' declares Dr. Macgregor, 'is in the most primitive stratum of Acts.' It is worthy of note that in this 'most primitive stratum' we find a plain and unequivocal declaration of our Lord's bodily resurrection. Peter quotes Ps 16 as a prophecy of this supreme event, arguing that it could not possibly refer to David as 'he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day' (v.^{29}). Obviously it was of the resurrection

of Christ that he spoke, for 'his flesh did not see corruption' (v.[31]) (in contradistinction to that of David's) of which fact, he confidently and exultantly declares, 'we are all witnesses' (v.[32]). Where would the force of Peter's argument be if the 'spiritual resurrection' view be correct? Why would he want to emphasize the fact of the empty tomb? How could he have argued in this way at all?

One gathers that, according to Dr. Macgregor, it is the Gospels that, on the whole, present us with the conception of reanimation, and it is against some of the stories that they contain that his attack is mainly directed.

Let us examine them. We are told that the earliest and most crucial passage is Mk 16^{6-8}. Is it? There appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1927 a fascinating article by Professor D. S. Margoliouth in which he argues powerfully for the priority of the Matthæan narrative: and startling as it may appear at first blush, it would not be easy to overthrow his position.

But even if we do grant that the Marcan passage is crucial, what does it say? The young man in a white robe tells the women: 'Ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, which hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold, the place where they laid him!' (v.[6]). How could the emptiness of the tomb be more explicitly stated than that? Dr. Macgregor quotes with approval Montefiore's comment on this passage. He says, *inter alia*, that 'the faith in the risen Messiah owes nothing to the discovery of the empty tomb. . . . The empty tomb story grew up afterwards.' *Grew up afterwards!* And here we find an account of it in the very passage from which Montefiore tries to prove that it was not in the earliest tradition. A curious piece of reasoning, forsooth!

The difficulty of which so much is made is the silence of the women. In spite of the command to 'tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee' we read that 'they said nothing to any man; for they were afraid.' Let it be frankly acknowledged that this presents a real problem: it flatly contradicts Matthew and Luke and also John. We may recognize at once, however, that we are dealing with an unfinished story. Can we really make confident statements about the account of Mark when so much of it is missing? Surely it must be an unwise procedure to build up an impressive argument upon a story that is half told, especially when, in the case of the empty tomb, it involves a contradiction of what the narrative contains. We might reasonably conjecture that if the end of the Gospel were known, the account of the women's silence would not be in such irreconcilable conflict with everything else that is related to us in the other Gospels. Would we be far wrong in suggesting that the famous 'shorter ending' which contains a declaration by the women to 'Peter and those about him' was a rough summary of the original (or a part of it) added by some one who knew of the original?

Apart from Margoliouth's ingenious theory, an interesting comment was made by Mr. T. Nicklin in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1927. He cites a parallel, so far as the words are concerned, in Mk 1^{44} where silence is enjoined upon the leper; he is at once to go to the priest. 'The point would seem to be,' says Mr. Nicklin, 'that urgent haste, in both cases alike, forbade the ordinary dilatoriness of courtesy and gossiping, familiar in the East.' The command in Lk 10^{4}, 'salute no one by the way,' which is paralleled by 2 K 4^{29}, is relevant to the same habit of Oriental society, '. . . the women fled in such haste that they disregarded all passers-by whom they met.'

This is quite a reasonable proposition and it may be the real solution, fitting in, as it does, with the aforementioned suggestion about the 'shorter ending.'

If we go a step further, however, and assume that the women kept silence in the company of the disciples, surely they could never have concealed their wonder and agitation: and if the disciples could get nothing out of them we may see in that very fact the reason for Peter and the other disciple's hurried journey to the tomb. 'What has happened?' we may assume their asking: 'these women won't say anything. They must have had some strange experience: that is obvious by their demeanour. We cannot understand it. We know where they went. We had better go to see what we can find out for ourselves.'

For my part I see no reason for rejecting the substantial accuracy of the account given in the Fourth Gospel, but I put forward the foregoing as demonstrating that we are definitely not shut up to the fantastic assertion that the story of the empty tomb must have grown up afterwards, if the women of Mark's story did not communicate any news. It contradicts the explicit statement of the Gospel itself.

The discrepancy between Luke and Matthew and Mark concerning the manifestations of Jesus is well known. Luke says nothing of the Galilean appearances, but describes everything as happening in Jerusalem. No new solution can be offered, but we can profitably remind ourselves of the old one: We are not reading well documented historical treatises, but fragmentary stories, some of them, perhaps, being the fusion of two or three others. Were the whole details given, we might easily see how all the accounts could be harmonized, even if only roughly. As it is, the defenders of the traditional theory point out that any reluctance in the disciples to go to Galilee might reasonably be accounted for by the collapse of their faith, and their unwillingness or inability (or both) to believe anything (cf. Lk 24^{11}). They stood in dire need to be reawakened with a glad surprise while they were still in Jerusalem. If this is correct, they had not to wait for many hours. Even then (if we can accept the testimony of the Fourth Gospel) Thomas was not ready to acknowledge the news as true until he saw for himself.

If Luke knew of the first message of Jesus to the women, about the promised Galilean appearance, we can only conjecture that he thought it unnecessary to give any explanations. Discrepancies in the Gospels in other stories besides those of the Resurrection never seem to give the authors any concern. Maybe they thought there was no reason why they should.

Whilst we are discussing this matter it is interesting to refer to the appendix of the Fourth Gospel. Here we have a resurrection story staged in Galilee. Perhaps questions were being asked on this very subject by the time that the Gospels were in circulation. 'Why have Luke and "John" nothing to say on the appearances of Jesus in Galilee?' some might argue. 'It is strange that Matthew (and Mark) give an account of one of them and the other two seem to know nothing about them.' If the appendix was added by John's circle of friends we can imagine their replying—'The aged apostle knew as much as any one about the appearances of Jesus in Galilee, but he did not choose to record them, any more than he chose to give an account of the Lord's Supper. We know, however, one story he used to tell quite frequently and of which he has made a record. We will therefore attach it to the Gospel he has recently finished' (cf. Jn 21^{24}).

It is rather piquant to recall that in the March issue, which contained Dr. Macgregor's concluding observations, there appeared an illuminating article by Mr. Eric F. F. Bishop upon certain details of this appendix story. It would seem as if, even in modern times, fishermen can catch their fish and prepare their meals much as they did two thousand years ago, and the manner in which Jesus prepared a meal for His disciples so early in the morning has not changed. Rightly does Mr. Bishop claim that 'the Lake of Galilee still holds echoes of the little actions, the very phraseology and at times perchance, when we have ears to hear, almost the accents of Jesus "as He was"' (p. 266).

Is Dr. Macgregor right, therefore, in claiming that the Galilean Resurrection appearances represent the primary tradition, comprising a 'glorification' conception and that the Jerusalem appearances bespeak a secondary tradition comprising a 'reanimation' conception? (p. 281). If the stories are taken altogether, with especial consideration of the one in Jn 21, it appears impossible to draw such a distinction. It is worthy of note that this chapter expressly declares that Jesus appeared to His disciples in Galilee 'after these things,' that is, after His appearances in Jerusalem.

Moreover, on Dr. Macgregor's theory we are left wondering why Jerusalem was the home of the early Christian Church and not Galilee. If Galilee was 'the birthplace of the Resurrection faith,' it would seem to follow, *ipso facto*, that the Christian Church would have had its origin there. We feel that the sum of the message of Peter's first sermon at Capernaum would have been: 'Men and

brethren, hearken. The body of Jesus of Nazareth may lie a-mouldering in the grave at Jerusalem, but His soul goes marching on. He has appeared to us here: we have all seen Him and we know.'

But have we any adequate reason for overthrowing Luke's and John's account as recorded in the Gospels and Acts? Did not the Christian Church have its origin at Jerusalem for the simple and sufficient reason that the resurrection faith was born *there* and that the final commands of the Risen Master were given at nearby Olivet?

II. We now turn to consider Luke's alleged insistence upon the 'material' nature of our Lord's resurrection body. We may concede that this may be somewhat coloured by his own point of view, but even here difficulties can be exaggerated. He can hardly be charged with holding a 'reanimation' theory that meant that the body was exactly the same as before. He recognized that it was one which could pass through doors and could appear and disappear instantaneously. He must have believed that the body was different from what it was in the days of His flesh, even if he is obviously more eager to note the points of resemblance rather than dissimilarity.

Perhaps the only really perplexing story is the account of Jesus' eating a piece of broiled fish (24^{42}). In no other place do we read of His actually partaking of food, as Dr. Macgregor acknowledges. The remark of Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Professor J. M. Shaw in his masterly article on the 'Resurrection of Christ' in the DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH may be mentioned. 'He did not eat for the sake of His body, but for their sakes with whom He conversed, to convince them that they were not seeing a ghost.' As a means of proving His real presence we are ready to admit that it appears childish and artificial, if it were staged as a serious action. But was it? If we accept its authenticity may we not see in it a display of quiet merriment on the part of our Lord that transforms the whole scene? Here are all the disciples quaking with fear, distracted with doubt, unable to make up their minds whether they are actually seeing their Risen Master. (Probably Peter and John, Cleopas and his companion knew differently, but they would be dumb with astonishment and wonder.) And He comforts and reassures them with one of the most precious of human qualities—a touch of humour. 'What is worrying you?' we feel He is saying; 'there is no need for alarm; none whatsoever. It is really I. Can you give me anything to eat?' And when a piece of fish is handed to Him, He forthwith consumes it, His eyes twinkling the while.

Would there not be a wealth of sympathetic understanding in adopting this method to restore the disciples' confidence? Can we not see their fear subsiding, their faces relaxing, and then a ripple of laughter running round the table, for all that it was a laughter that 'floated on a lake of tears'? This suggestion may be repellent to some, but it is advanced not without the hope that others will feel that, in the splendour of our Lord's victory, in the glory that flashed forth on that first Easter day, His humanity was as palpable as His divinity, and humour was shown to be in the heart of the Great Physician of souls as one of His most glorious healing remedies.

What of the evidence as related by St. Paul? Dr. Macgregor acknowledges from the manner in which the Apostle submits it 'it, would certainly be wrong to deduce from this that he . . . disbelieved in the story of the empty tomb. The tradition would be generally accepted by the time Paul wrote; and in any case, not only would the ordinary Jewish view of bodily Resurrection imply an empty grave, but also Paul's own teaching about the Resurrection body. Jesus appears in His σῶμα πνευματικόν which is the σῶμα ψυχικόν, "changed"; the latter, therefore, can no longer rest in the tomb' (p. 280).

All this one can readily agree with. It is to be observed that Paul is credited with believing in the empty tomb. Can we say that he believed in 'glorification' as opposed to 'reanimation'? Does that distinction exist in his mind? He may, and does, draw the 'clearest possible parallel between Jesus' Resurrection and that of believers in general' (p. 218). But he does not make the cases absolutely identical.

If we refer to Peter's speech in Ac 2^{22-32}, and compare it with Paul's in Ac 13^{34-37}, we see that

the argument employed is much the same. According to both, the experience of Jesus is unique. To them it was no difficulty to believe that the 'Holy One of God,' who did no sin, nor was guile found in His mouth, should be so raised. It followed naturally from a life that had been unsullied by sin. He was 'marked out to be the Son of God with power . . . when He was raised from the dead.' We do not think this involves an impossibly 'materialistic' conception of the Resurrection when we remember the One about whom the claim was made.

Can it be said that Paul would believe precisely the same of the bodies of Christians who were dead (some of whom would be completely destroyed)? He knew, as every one else knew, that their bodies *did* see corruption. Christ's did not. Most certainly he would regard our Lord's resurrection body as a spiritual body. But one feels that there is nothing incongruous in his conception of the Risen Master and in the descriptions given us in the Gospels. (The one really doubtful case, of our Lord's eating a piece of fish has already been dealt with.) Paul does not enter into a careful distinction between Christ's resurrection body and those of believers in general. As we have seen, their earthly bodies have seen corruption where His has not; but in the final issue there will be no vital difference, any more than there will be any difference between the spiritual bodies of those who are dead and those who will be alive at the Second Advent.

The subject of the Ascension does not constitute a serious difficulty. We may well accept the view that there were many 'ascensions.' We are not shut up, in the traditional belief, to the idea that the disciples thought of Jesus as hovering about the earth for forty days, sometimes seen, sometimes not. When He was not with them (and that would be for the far greater part of the time), we may credit them with believing that He was with His Heavenly Father. We are not concerned with mediæval ideas of the Ascension, still less with the notion that the Ascension implies, according to Dr. Macgregor, that 'another change was necessary before Christ was finally glorified' (p. 218). The Gospel records and Acts give no hint of this. All that is to be said of *the* Ascension is that it marked the last of our Lord's appearances. (Paul was specially favoured, receiving a manifestation 'as one born out of due season' as he himself acknowledges.) Could the desired impression be given in any other way? 'We cannot imagine' Dr. Gore justly claims, 'how, without some such impressive occurrence, bringing the appearances of Christ to a decisive end, the disciples could have reached the state of mind in which we find them in the opening of the Acts, in which they are wholly without expectation of any more "manifestations" of Christ and wholly set on what is promised them —spiritual equipment for a task of unknown magnitude' (*Belief in God*, 273).

In all that has been written, I would not wish to emphasize the difference between the view-point here maintained and that advanced by Dr. Macgregor. When he declares that 'the chief evidence for the Resurrection is the existence of the Christian Church and the persistence of the resurrection faith in the hearts of millions of believers' every one must surely agree.

But when he quotes with approval the dictum of Denney that 'if we don't accept the Resurrection on grounds which lie outside of the Gospel narratives we shall not accept it on the grounds presented in them' we feel bound to reply: 'If we *do* accept the Resurrection on grounds outside this area, there seems to be little or no purpose in rejecting the evidence of the Gospel stories as a valuable supplement to all that we have learned elsewhere.'

To take one final look at the empty tomb. We may freely acknowledge, even on the evidence of the Gospels, that it is of secondary importance when compared with the appearances of the Lord Himself. Indeed, it is instructive to note, as the writer of the Fourth Gospel is careful to point out, that whereas the 'other disciple' was convinced by the spectacle ('he saw and believed' 20^{8}), Mary Magdalene was most decidedly not. Her conviction was, in the now world-famous words, that 'they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him' (20^{13}). Obviously it is the presence of the Risen Master, rather than the emptiness of His last earthly resting place, that is

the real inspiration of the disciples' faith. But why attempt to set the two in opposition? Does not the empty tomb afford a natural corollary to the main evidence? As both facts are embedded in the earliest traditions of the Gospel narratives (and, so far as we can judge, that of the Pauline writings) what gain is there in seeking to disparage the one in order to exalt the other?

Nay more. In spite of Denney's avowal, some believers will find in a narrative like the Walk to Emmaus greater evidential value than the bare recital of facts given by St. Paul. If there is a lovelier story in all the wide world we have yet to discover it. It is one of those revelations of surpassing beauty which awakens within us a profound sense of gratitude to God that we should ever be privileged to receive it. And what of the thrilling narrative of that early morning breakfast by the sunlit shores of Lake Galilee, when Peter (that erring yet noble and warm-hearted disciple) received his three-fold commission to feed both the sheep and the lambs of his Master? Have we not here something that belongs, not merely to an age but to all time—a story which carries the evidence of its own truthfulness in every word that is recorded? Can we easily believe that any one could have imagined such a scene?

The Resurrection is the greatest fact in history. The facts that attest it are rich and varied. It is obvious that some of the evidence makes little or no appeal to certain minds. But so far as the majority of the Gospel narratives are concerned there are others who see in them every reason gratefully to accept them as precious inheritances, eminently worthy to be classed among those things 'which have been fully established among us.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Two Open Fires.

By the Reverend James Duffill, M.A., Bourn, Cambridgeshire.

'A fire of coals.'—Jn 18^{18} 21^{9}.

I wonder how many of you have ever been camping? If you have been, I think you will agree with me that one of the greatest joys of camping is the camp-fire. Think of some of those evenings sitting round the fire with one's friends. All around is dark, except perhaps for a few lights out at sea or a bright star. And to the accompaniment of the music of crackling sticks in the fire you listen to a thrilling story or a good-night yarn. Yes, I think these are some of the best memories of camp life.

Now I am going to tell you a story of two open fires—just like camp-fires, only they were not at camp.

The first open fire was at night—a cold night. The fire was burning in an open yard. It was a dark night and there were no electric lamps or other illumination. Figures crossed to and fro in this yard and they could be seen only dimly. Round the fire were some men—the servants belonging to the house of which the yard was part. They were telling the events of the day; perhaps cracking jokes; perhaps annoyed because they had to hang about late that night—they knew their master had something special on. Many people passed in and out of the yard, and some took advantage of the fire. Amongst them came one man looking thoroughly miserable. He approached the fire rather sheepishly; he didn't seem anxious to be seen: but he was cold and the fire attracted. As a flame of the fire lit up his face one of the men round the fire recognized him: he had seen him before somewhere, and then it suddenly struck him where. So he said rather roughly—'You belong to this Man's crowd.' The miserable man started and replied quickly, 'What man?' 'You know quite well,' came the reply; 'they call him Jesus of Nazareth, I think. I've seen you with Him.' 'I don't know the Man,' came the answer. And he who said this was Simon Peter. Yes, and this was the third time that night that he had said the same thing.

That was one fire.

A few weeks later another fire was set up. This time it was not in a courtyard, but on a lake-side. It was early morning, and some cold, wet fishermen, disappointed by a fruitless night's fishing, were cheered by the sight of a fire as they made towards the land. And they, with One who met them, sat

down to breakfast round that open fire. It was a very different party from that round the first fire, but there was one who was at both, and that was Simon Peter.

They had breakfast. It was rather a silent breakfast, for the fishermen were a little frightened and mystified by it all. Their host was none other than Jesus, who had risen from the dead.

A long silence was broken by Jesus Himself turning to Peter and saying, 'Simon, lovest thou Me?' 'Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love Thee' came the reply. A second time was the question asked, and the same answer given. And yet a third time came from the lips of Jesus, 'Simon, lovest thou Me,' and for the third time Peter said 'Yes.'

That was the second fire.

The first fire is unspeakably sad—what pathetic weakness and cruel desertion; the second fire is simple and delightful—a touching story of new resolves and real devotion.

Peter, the miserable, unhappy, cowardly man of the first fire, becomes, from the time of the second fire, the bold, courageous, loving disciple, never again to waver or to fail.

The first fire says—'No'; the second fire says—'Yes.' The first fire was a tragedy; the second fire was a victory.

In the difference of these two fires there is all the difference between Good Friday and Easter. But just as we have connected these two fires, so there is connexion between Good Friday and Easter. In the same way that we should not know the real truth of Simon Peter without a knowledge of both incidents, so we should not know the full truth of Jesus Christ without the knowledge of both Good Friday and Easter Day.

We know because of Good Friday that Jesus is Love: we know because of Easter that Jesus is victorious over sin.

We know because of Good Friday that Jesus forgives: we know because of Easter that Jesus is alive and able to help all His children.

Reported by Reuter.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'A true report.'—2 Ch 9[5].

It was the Queen of Sheba who said that. She was the Queen who went to see Solomon. She had heard so much about Solomon's wisdom and Solomon's splendour that she wanted to find out for herself whether what she had heard was true. So she left her land, which it is believed was what is now called Abyssinia, bringing with her costly gifts to give to Solomon. But when she met him and heard him speak and saw his magnificence there was, says the Bible, 'no more spirit in her,' that is, it simply bowled her over. So she confessed it was no rumour but 'a true report' she had heard in her country, and that indeed the half had never been told her.

In our own case, too, it is of course very important that the things we are told should be true and not made up stories or fabrications. One who felt it was so was St. John, who guessed that when men came to read the wonderful things he had to relate concerning Jesus they would say that such things were too good to be true. So he wrote at the end of his Gospel—'we know' that this record is true. And as we read these stories ourselves with regularity and reverence and care, even we shall come to know within ourselves that they are true, and that indeed, as somebody said, they are 'too good not to be true.'

It would be well, too, wouldn't it, that those who write records of any sort should make certain that what they put in is true, so that people who read them afterwards can trust what they say. Sir Walter Raleigh, who was such a courteous and chivalrous man, once when in prison passed the weary hours writing a history of the world. After he had completed the second book something happened which made him think that perhaps what he had said was inaccurate, and so, sooner than that men should read and accept what he was not sure of, he tore up the whole book, although it had cost him such pains to write it. And that we should have only what is accurate in our histories is tremendously important indeed. Some countries don't say what is correct about other countries, and it creates very wrong impressions and so dispeace. Others, I believe, are better. In the United States and our own country, steps have been taken to see that only what is fair and true will be written in our history books.

I wish that were the standard too in all the newspapers. All kinds of reports and rumours are published in some of them, and people scarcely know what is true. Of course that isn't always the case. This appeared some time ago at the foot of a newspaper paragraph—

'This was not reported by Reuter,'

which meant, apparently, that it mightn't be true. Supposing however that it had been 'reported by Reuter' it would be trustworthy. And who is

Reuter? Or what is Reuter? It is a news agency which collects news from all over the world; but about a century ago it was started by a man called Paul Reuter. Paul Reuter was born in a little German town, became a clerk in an uncle's bank, and becoming interested in the telegraph and sensing its value for gathering news, finally came across to London and set up in business. By and by, he had agents collecting news in every corner of the earth and sending it back by cable and telegraph. Most important of all, however, he made up his mind that he would only report what was correct, so that when people saw the name 'Reuter' with a piece of news they could be sure it was to be trusted.

So also should it be with ourselves: we should be sure of anything we write or say. Always be exceedingly careful not to put your name to anything or pass on anything of which you aren't entirely certain. A teacher of mine had a motto carved and hung up in the classroom. It was one word only—

'ACCURACY'

And to be accurate or exact in all we say is an excellent thing: and when we are, others will say of anything told them by us that it is 'a true report,' or of anything written by us that our 'record is true.'

The Christian Year.

PALM SUNDAY.

His Challenge to Everybody.

'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God . . . took upon him the form of a servant.'—Ph 2^{5-7}.

No impartial student of the Gospels can miss their central emphasis. They are dominated by the ideal of service. Whether we explore our Lord's teaching, or try to understand His life, we are without the key to their interpretation till we catch this central note. Service is the spinal column of the Gospels. When our Lord preached His first sermon, He gave a rough outline of His programme, and every item in it is an aspect of service. His loveliest parables, such as the Good Samaritan, and parables of Final Judgment, are expositions of the necessity and ultimate significance of service. His earthly vocation and His sacrificial death were shaped to fulfil the ends of service. Amongst all the alternative expressions of life that were open to Him to choose He deliberately selected 'the form of a servant.' Paul sees in this self-emptying of our Lord a unique and incredible act of grace. But beyond every other consideration, what impressed him was its challenge. 'Let the same disposition be in you which was in Christ Jesus.' Why did our Lord take the form of a servant, and why should we do likewise?

1. First of all, He took the form of a servant because this was the form in which He could most effectively help men. There are those who believe that this specific rôle which our Lord assumed, was suggested to Him by the 'servant' passages in Is 53. But it was not the teachings of the unknown prophet of the Exile which gave this particular direction to His career. It was the urge of His own redemptive heart, which indeed, as it happened, found an unexpected echo and utterance in the writings of Isaiah. When Jesus came to this earth, what confronted Him everywhere was the existence of a world where need was universal.

J. B. Priestley, in his work, *They Walk in the City*, speaking of modern youth, poignantly describes them as 'Climbing to their attics, eyes pricking and burning, staring into the deeper darkness of their closed eyelids and tormented by vague, moving shapes of fear and despair.' Confronted as we are to-day with this illimitable and shoreless sea of human need, how can we evade the challenge of service? Religion may, and does, take many forms. It may take intellectual forms, stating in doctrine and creed what are the implications of its faith. It may take ecclesiastical forms, and engage its strength in such interests as organization, Church polity, and government. It may take æsthetic forms, and seek to express its life through sacrament, symbol and ritual. It may take purely emotional and subjective forms, and concern itself with the comforts, delights, and interior satisfactions of the faith. These varied and multiple expressions of religious life have their place, and genuinely meet and satisfy certain needs of the soul. But religion has not entered the kingdom to which Christ has appointed it till it gets to grips with elemental human need, and brings the unsearchable riches of Christ to bear on human poverty.

2. He took the form of a servant because this was the form in which He most resembled God. When Jesus drew a mental picture of God, He did not think of Him, like many of the sons of the East, as a Being without attributes and actionless; nor like the Muslims, as a Celestial Potentate, coldly remote, otiose and apathetic to human need. He conceived of Him rather as a Being implicated

in the works of His hands, and ceaselessly devoted to their interests. Dr. Jowett, the Master of Balliol, reminds us that many of God's works take to do with what we call 'secular' work. He is ceaselessly engaged in such activities as sustaining His worlds, maintaining the integrity of His laws, running His Cosmos. Isaiah dwells magnificently on that aspect of God's activity. Yet it is in His ministrations to the needs of the sons of men, in whom is all His delight, that He exerts His most effortful and beneficent influence. In the Incarnation of Jesus Christ His Son we have all the evidence we need that there is no care He will not take, no effort He will not make, no sacrifice He will not endure, that 'He may lead many sons to glory.' 'When I try to bow to Thee,' sings Tagore, 'my obeisance cannot reach down to the depth where Thy feet rest among the poorest and lowliest and lost.' Jesus' motive for service is the Royal Example. 'As My Father,' He says, 'has continued working to this hour, so I work too.' In one remarkable passage in John's Gospel He reveals, in the form of a Sacrament, both the nature of that service and His motive for doing it. He washes His disciples' feet. And it is not simply by way of rebuke He performs this menial office, it is more by way of illumination. In doing what He does, He is lighting up the heart of God.

Here, then, is a challenge to us all, the pressure of which indeed we may evade, but the gleaming splendour of which we cannot fail to see. What does it mean to be like the Father? What is the essence of divinity within us?

It is to do to others what Jesus did to His disciples. It is to use not little powers in the performance of great duties, but rather to harness mighty powers to the discharge of humble tasks. When Albert Schweitzer dedicates his quite unusual gifts and powers to assuaging the pain of African negroes, he is following in the Master's footsteps. And wherever there are men and women anywhere, inspired by the Spirit of Jesus, who give themselves to the ministry of human helpfulness by loyal and unashamed devotion to the humblest and obscurest of tasks, it is as though they were rehearsing the Christ-sacrament of service, and revealing once again to a blind and unseeing world the character of God as Servant.

3. Finally, Christ took the form of a servant because this was the most effective avenue to personal influence. It would be a mistake to assume that Christ was unconcerned about His influence. How could He be? He was a King, and He had come to found a Kingdom, and He looked forward with eagerness to the time when that Kingdom would take root in the earth, and grow and spread till it covered the habitable globe. And as He reflected and considered alternative methods of securing permanent influence, and was tempted, as in the wilderness, to try now this method and again that, ultimately, amongst other reasons, He deliberately selected the form of a servant for this cogent reason also, that it was the royal way to the conquest of the human heart. Christ Himself draws His disciples' attention to the novelty of His method. 'The kings of the Gentiles exercise authority over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so. But he that is greatest among you, let him be the least, and he that is chief as he that serves.'

Privilege and selfishness are doomed to futility and extinction; serviceableness and sacrifice are rewarded with perpetuity and permanent influence. That is the explicit mind of Jesus; but it is also the teaching of history and experience. It is the corn of wheat that falls into the ground and dies, that bears much fruit. That law of survival is impressively illustrated in every form of institutional life. Some time ago the American statistician, Babson, made a survey of a hundred institutions in the New England States, covering a period of a hundred years. He discovered that of those hundred that lived a self-regarding and self-protective life, only five remained, and even so in a state of decadence. He then took a hundred institutions, in the same area, and covering the same period of time, that existed for the benefit of others; and he discovered that ninety-five of them existed and flourished to the present day.

What is true of institutional life is still more demonstrably true of individual life. 'Let this disposition be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' There is no more significant form that the religious life can assume than 'the form of a servant.' As we would help our fellow-men in their need, as we would resemble God in His perfection, as we would choose to leave behind us an influence that is abiding, as we would accept the challenge of Christ's life and death, then among all the alternative forms through which we may express our lives, forms which ambition, good-will, religious motives, or even self-interest dictate, let us select as the highest, the richest, and the most significant, the one our Lord Himself deliberately chose to be the vehicle of His life: 'the form of a servant.' [1]

[1] R. Menzies, *The Magnet of the Heart*, 158 f.

Easter Day.

The Parable of the Resurrection.

'Thou foolish one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be.'—1 Co $15^{36.37}$ (R.V.).

Paul, in this magnificent chapter of his on the Resurrection, thinks it worth his while to devote a whole paragraph to the analogy to the Resurrection which the processes of Nature furnish.

But it is not upon what he saw taking place each year in Nature that Paul based his faith in the Resurrection. It is with the account of the resurrection of Jesus that he begins this mighty chapter. He quotes the evidence for it. He summons up his witnesses. The resurrection of Jesus to Paul was a definite historical fact; a fact on the same plane exactly, and in the same sense exactly, as His death was a fact. A great party in Palestine believed in a resurrection—the Pharisaic party—and to that party Paul in his pre-Christian days belonged, and in the view of that party probably all the other disciples shared. But although the Pharisaic party contended strongly for it, belief in a resurrection could scarcely be called a settled belief amongst the Jews. It was a subject of debate. The Sadducees challenged it and denied it. Even an ardent Pharisee like Paul might have his days when he wondered if it was true. It was the appearance of Jesus to himself personally, and the fact that He had appeared also to those honest men whose names he mentions, that settled the matter so far as Paul was concerned. It converted his hope into certitude. As Paul thinks of it, the resurrection of Jesus was not an exceptional and abnormal experience. It is the experience that is to happen to us all. Christ is the firstfruits of them that slept. He is the representative Man. What was special and peculiar to Christ was that, for the comfort and help of men, what happens to men after death was in Him made visible. 'Because he lives, we shall live also.'

It is after he has set forth the grounds of his certainty about Resurrection that he pens his paragraph about the Parable of Nature. He does so to clear away certain difficulties in the way of belief in a Resurrection. He imagines some one saying, 'How are the dead raised? and with what body do they come?' As if a man should say, 'Yes, that is all very well, but I do not see how there *can* be a Resurrection.'

As Robertson says in one of his sermons, 'All that we know of life is connected with a shape, a form, a body of material elements; and now that is palpably melting away into nothingness and inevitably almost, as the eye grows dim and speech fails and breath stops and we see before us only something which can give no answer and make no response, we have forced upon us the idea that life has ended for ever. It is a terrific challenge, and the stoutest soul sometimes feels it has no answer to give.'

The Apostle does not try to argue men over the difficulty. What he says to them is this: 'Look abroad—when the flowers appear on the earth and the time of the singing of birds is come, that is exactly what happens, appearances are belied and out of seeming death life issues.'

Analogy does not amount to proof. Robertson defines analogy as 'probability from a parallel case.' That there is an annual resurrection in Nature does not of course *prove* that there is a resurrection of mankind. But it *does* dispose of the objection that resurrection is impossible. That is exactly the use Paul makes in this paragraph of the yearly parable of the resurrection in Nature. His positive proof for the resurrection is the resurrection of Jesus. He is meeting here just the difficulty men feel from the appearance of death—the report about death which their senses convey to them.

Let us consider this annual parable of the Resurrection.

First of all the parable of the Resurrection preaches the great truth that *death can issue in life*. Spring is a great preacher of the Resurrection. There is a passage in that book, *If Winter Comes*, in which the writer speaks of the suggestiveness of October. Nature was to him in October, and not in spring, poignantly suggestive in her intense and visible occupation. She was stripping her house of its deckings, dismantling her habitation to the least and uttermost leaf; but she stripped, dismantled, extinguished, broke away not in despair, defeat, but in ordered preparation and exquisite certitude of glory anew. That was October's voice to him. It was not 'Take down. It is done.' It was, 'Take down. It is beginning.' Sabre used to think, 'You *can't* walk along lanes or in woods in October and see all this mysterious business going on without knowing perfectly well that this astounding certainty must apply equally to human life. I'd wish the death of any one I loved to be in early autumn. No one can possibly *doubt* in early autumn. In winter, perhaps; and in spring and in summer, you can know, cynically, it will pass. But in October, no. Not then! Life! You can only feel, *know*, that the thing will break and that

there is an uplift at the bottom of it all. There *must* be. Take down. It is beginning.' It is only in the light of spring we can read the real meaning of October.

We may take the Apostle's own illustration. Back in the winter, or else in the early days of spring—while yet all was bare and chill—the farmer tramped across his brown and upturned fields, scattering his seed as he went. And for weeks nothing but the bare brown earth was to be seen. And if we could have penetrated beneath the surface what we should have discovered would have made us feel that nothing ever would be seen. For the seed flung into the soil in process of time rotted and disintegrated and died. But already the green blade has made its appearance, and in the autumn we shall see those fields yellow with waving corn. The death of the seed was not the end of its life. It issued in larger life. Seeming death was followed by resurrection. 'Thou foolish one, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.' But out of death life has come.

With this miracle spread before our eyes, it is easy to believe in resurrection; it is impossible to believe in anything else. At death it is not a case of 'Take down. It is done.' It is a case of 'Take down. It is beginning.' For if God does all this for the grass of the field, shall He not, will He not do as much for His children?

The second truth the parable of the resurrection in Nature teaches us is this—the life that comes through death is richer and fuller than this life which ends in death. 'That which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be.' We bury a bulb in the brown earth. The bulb is not a particularly prepossessing thing to look at. But that bulb buried in the earth issues in the fragrant hyacinth or the tulip with its vivid colour. The grain in the farmer's hand is a hard uncomely-looking thing, but he casts it into the ground in which it rots and dies and by and by there issues from it the golden harvest. Through death the seed enters upon nobler life. And from that parable of the resurrection in Nature Paul would have us gather the assurance that so also is it in the resurrection of the dead. The life we gain is larger and richer than that which we lose; the life we begin is finer and freer than that which we bring to an end. Life is a good thing; it brings us many pleasures and delights; it is rich in love and affection. But it is cramped and fettered. We cannot do what we want to do or be what we want to be. We form plans we are not able to complete. We cherish ambitions we are not able to realize. We are fretted by insufficient time and inadequate powers. But in the new life to which God brings us we shall have time, we shall have power, we shall have conscious freedom; there will be no ache of unsatisfied desire, or pain of disappointment.

Shall we listen to the parable which Nature is preaching once again? It is the dawn of the eternal day.[1]

First Sunday after Easter.

Human Insufficiency.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'Friend, lend me three loaves.'—Lk 11[5].

George Borrow, who travelled as a colporteur in Spain when it was even more dangerous than now to engage there in such a task, describes in his book, *The Bible in Spain*, his inhospitable reception at Villafranca. The first inn at which he knocked was full, and the stables under water. At the next, he says, 'I was answered from the window by a gruff voice nearly in the words of Scripture, "Trouble me not. The door is now shut and my children are with me in bed. I cannot arise to let you in."'

The point of this parable is of course just the certainty that God will answer prayer, if it show its earnestness by being persistent. When even a sleepy friend, bedded with his family, will yield at last not to the claims of friendship but to importunity, if his neighbour keeps on asking, how much more will not God hear earnest prayer! How absurd, then, for a man with any faith in God, the Heavenly Father, to cease from prayer!

Yet men do neglect prayer, and tire of prayer; and the parable notices or teaches that the emergencies of life drive unwilling men to prayer. When an unexpected call makes a bigger demand on them than they can meet, it is natural to turn to a neighbour or a friend. Why not turn with the same importunity and hopefulness to God?

One may also mark the suggestion that the emergency for which we are unprepared, the demand that we cannot meet, may come to us in the course of our social life. The need we feel is not for our own sake merely, but for the sake of others. How are we to play our part in life where other people make so large a call on us for more than we can do, for more than we have to give? We are exhausted, we have no more resources of our own. Empty-handed, dead-tired though we

[1] J. D. Jones, *Keep Festival*, 122.

be, neighbours, friends, mere acquaintances even, clamour for help. On what reserves can we draw? If we feel we have none, we are thrown back on prayer.

1. One demand that life makes on most men is for long-continued, faithful service. Others depend upon us, not perhaps in any way that seems very important, still they count on us and rely on us not to let them down. In their book on Soviet Russia, the Webbs state their impression that whereas in our country the part of its work that is best performed is the inconspicuously efficient service of smaller officials like stationmasters and postmasters and others discharging routine responsibilities, this is the weakest element in present-day Russia. Its youth are willing to volunteer for anything, however risky or laborious, that is spectacular, to join the army or a gang of navvies digging a canal in record time; but the equally necessary posts in which the duties are not exciting are not well served.

How society depends upon the faithfulness of humble servants came out in a startling and tragic fashion at one recent inquest on the victims of a railway disaster. The signalman confessed that he had simply forgotten for a moment that the other train was on the line. And for thirty years he had never made a mistake. People sometimes think that automatic devices of all sorts have taken away most of the risks of railway travel. In busy junctions, and on single lines, there are all kinds of inter-locking arrangements that prevent a careless man, or even an ignorant man, from setting the points and signals wrongly. This accident brought out the fact that even on a main line it is just the exact reliability of one man that guards against unspeakable disaster. And it is a long time to carry on faithfully, pulling signals for twenty or thirty years without an error.

But it may not be the monotony of toil that makes life too difficult, but the weight of care and responsibility. 'Have I conceived all this people,' said Moses to the Lord, 'that thou shouldest say, "Carry them in thy bosom as a nursing father carrieth a child."' 'It's the willing beast that gets the burden,' says the proverb, and it is too true that society quickly notices the people who are willing to take their share of hard and ungrateful tasks, and rewards them by piling more and more responsibility on them, till they stagger beneath the load. Nervous breakdowns, psychologists tell us, are not the result of hard labour, if it is labour a person can do. They come from the pressure of work that a man feels incompetent to do, of demands he knows he cannot meet; it is not work, but worry, that wrecks the balance of the mind.

It is no doubt true that some over-loaded people contrive to carry on with amazing self-confidence, even jauntiness. But a deeper trust will usually be felt in a leader or teacher or physician who seems in some degree gravely concerned as to the responsibilities he assumes. Surely because we, all of us, live beside those who expect more from us than it is really in us to give—help, counsel, strengthening friendship; because such demands meet us daily and we fear to be found wanting, and we know the meagreness of our own resources in wisdom and character, we ought to be found often and earnestly in prayer.

It is not as if there were limits to what we dare ask of God. Sir Robert Ball has pointed out how tiny a fraction of the rays sent out by the sun falls on this earth. Of all the light and heat poured forth from the sun, our world takes no more in comparison than a sip taken from a lake by a swallow that skims its surface. 'Friend, lend me three loaves.' It is no great demand, nor are our largest petitions anything to strain the resources of God. Let us enlarge our prayers to the widest stretch of our faith and imagination, and then recall the apostolic declaration: 'He is able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.' Augustine has this conviction behind him in his much-quoted prayer: 'Lord, give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt.' If patience, perseverance, love, wisdom, courage, are demanded, whatever God requires of him, God can supply.

Are we weak and heavy-laden,
Cumbered with a load of care?
Jesus only is our refuge,
Take it to the Lord in prayer.

In this regard Christ is Himself the great Example. It is not conveyed in the Gospels that He walked in His path of service easily. The tired look on His kind face after He had dealt with many that were possessed with devils, and all that were sick, moved Matthew to apply to Him that Scripture, 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases.' When a woman touched the hem of His garment, something in the trembling, eager, yet furtive contact caused the heart of the Master a pang, so that, as He said, 'I perceived that power was gone forth from me.' Men looking at Him, who was about thirty years old, guessed that He was not yet fifty. With His head resting on the gunwale of the boat He fell asleep, tired out, in the storm that terrified

the disciples. And if Jesus nevertheless was ever serene, ready for the occasion, Master of the event, His secret is open to all to read. He leaned continually on God. Again and again in crises He sought special opportunities of prayer; before making choice of the Twelve, and in moments of special temptation, in the wilderness, when they would take Him by force to make Him king, at the last agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. Jesus is the example of prayer, and what prayer can do.

In this busy world, surrounded by demands of all kinds for qualities and capacities more than we possess, how are we to do? Abraham Lincoln made this confession: 'I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for that day.' If we are not to fail our fellows, if we are not to break down we need to pray.

2. The story of the friend at midnight stays in the mind because of the vivid way Jesus there pictures an incident of common village life. It shows with what an acute and kindly eye Jesus noted the simple happenings in humble homes, so that men feel there is no situation outside His sympathetic interest.

Every housewife knows how it is to get through the day relieved that the needs of the household have been met, even though there is little or nothing over, and how disconcerting at a late hour to have all calculations upset by the arrival of a guest. In these circumstances it might be easy to ask a neighbour to oblige, but pride stands in the way. It is not agreeable to confess how small is the margin, to let a gossipy friend know how little there is to spare in one's cupboard. So many people would rather make any effort or send to a distant shop rather than beg a loan of provision.

In this story, however, a man is forced to cast pride aside. Circumstances have beaten him. It is too late to do anything but ask help. All he can do is to go round to a neighbour's door, and batter on it till the man is aroused, and make his urgent plea 'Friend, lend me three loaves. Enable me to save my face before this guest. Don't let me be shamed before this stranger who depends on me for food and shelter this night, and has caught me at a disadvantage.'

This story, counselling us to prayer in our emergencies suggests the mood of many a parent when a little child has arrived in the home. All sorts of preparations have been made; but does there not arise, suddenly perhaps, in a parent's heart the sense that other things will be needed soon? Here is a little soul that will soon be hungry for spiritual food. A little mind that will be asking deep questions. 'What creed will I share with him? What instruction shall I give about the path of life? With what influences shall I surround him? How shall I entertain this new guest come to spend his early years with me?' And if such thoughts come with the coming of a child they remain and keep stirring in the mind of any good parent with children in his house. He may feed and clothe them, but into what faith can he lead them? With what knowledge can he nourish their minds? He has little enough. Before these high demands he feels bankrupt of resources.

So a wise and anxious father or mother will turn to God. 'Friend, lend me three loaves.' It is not the things we have ourselves, but things only God can provide that will enable us to supply the needs of our children—forgiveness, cleansing, pure desires, the Holy Spirit to teach the truth and lead them in the way everlasting.

Second Sunday after Easter.

The Heroic Christ.

By the Reverend J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., Aberdeen.

'I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.'—Jn 10^{11}.

In a Sunday school I know, there were a number of framed coloured pictures. One was an attractive illustration of Daniel, garbed in clothes made for action, keeping the lions at bay. Courage, character, alertness were exquisitely portrayed in that picture of the Israelitish prophet. One Sunday a lad, pointing at his hero Daniel, said: 'I like him.' Then he turned to a representation of Christ in long, flowing garments. The master's face was gentle, but alongside Daniel it seemed weak and lacking character. He held a long, thin crook, and He carried a lamb in His arms. Jerking his finger at the picture the boy said, 'I don't like Him, He's soft.'

Blasphemous, but natural. 'I like Daniel in the lions' den, but I don't like Jesus and His lamb,' and the boy was not to blame. So often our representations of the Master are just pretty pictures of 'some one' carrying a lamb; there is light and colour, but virility is lacking; they fail to portray the real character of the Good Shepherd. It was not surprising that this youngster made the choice he did. But Christ says of Himself: 'I lay down my life for the sheep,' and His own picture

of the Good Shepherd is one that should kindle the imagination and claim the hero-worship of every boy. It is the picture of a fighting Shepherd in contrast with a craven hireling. The hireling when he sees the wolf coming, runs away—'he leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth the sheep.' But the Good Shepherd stays, faces and fights the wolves, wrestles and kills, until in the end He may be killed Himself, giving His life for the sheep.

This picture of the Fighting Christ, battling for His flock even to the laying down of His life, far surpasses that of Daniel in the den of lions, and it is the real portrait of the Good Shepherd. The picture of Jesus with a lamb in His arms is true, but is not all the truth. I am sure Jesus carried His lambs—the Shepherd who could give His life for the sheep must also have been infinitely tender and gentle. To the nature that could make the supreme sacrifice, the lesser sacrifice in care and kindness must have been natural—but the character of the Good Shepherd is not completely seen in such qualities. The hireling might have them also; he, too, would be mindful of the sheep for his hire's sake. The test of the difference between the hireling and the true shepherd came not in time of peace, but in the hour of danger. Then the Good Shepherd gave His life for the sheep—the hireling fled.

A picture that could make a boy actively dislike Christ was, of course, bad art. Unfortunately, bad art is not confined to children's pictures, it is often seen in pictures of Calvary. The Saviour is shown hanging on a beautiful Cross, a halo round His head—indeed, some conceptions of the Cross suggest weakness rather than strength, they are on a par with that Sunday school picture of Jesus with the lamb in His arms, they miss the meaning of our Saviour's sacrifice. Not that tenderness and pity are not seen on the Cross—they are; and they have claimed the adoring homage of countless souls in every Christian century—adoration that is certainly not divorced from sentiment—but it is a tenderness born of tragedy.

Though the love seen on Calvary may soften the hardened sinner, there is nothing weak about that love—it fought with sin and death. No, although the Cross has love in it, it was not lovely—indeed, whatever art may do to beautify it, it stands out against an evil background. It was not God who nailed Christ to the Cross, but man—man at his worst. Although love allowed the Saviour to go the length of giving Himself for our salvation, it was man's brutality that drove Him to it. And man's crucifixion of Jesus is not something to sentimentalize about, it is something to weep over. There is tragedy in the picture which demands an honest facing of its meaning, with all that is merely sentimental banished. The real picture is Christ fighting, fighting, fighting the wolves of Hell and of sin, that would ravish and scatter the flock, until, at last, those human wolves of bygone days murdered Him on a cruel Cross. 'The Good Shepherd gave His life for the sheep.'

Of course, God's loving care for us does enter into Calvary. In a very real sense Christ was the sacrifice for sin; in the Crucifixion we have literally God giving Himself thus for our salvation. And when I think of the wonder and mystery of that great truth, of how God overturns even the ghastly sin of man, and makes this Crucifixion the sign and seal of His forgiveness and our salvation, I cannot help but worship and adore with awe and reverence so divine a love, despite my remembrance in shame of man's wickedness. But, if we hide the real meaning in a sentimental conception of a sacrificial lamb, and miss the vital relationship of Calvary to Christ's life—His life given for us—we have failed to understand half of what the Cross really means. We may see Christ the lamb slain as an offering for our sins, but we shall miss Christ as the Good Shepherd fighting unto death to save mankind, to save us from the wolves that would scatter the flock and ruin our lives. 'The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.' Yes, the Cross also portrays a Fighting Christ.

One of the great doctrines of the Reformed Church is the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. I am not entering into its merits here; I would merely state that it is claimed, on good scriptural grounds, that all believers are priests unto God. But the claim is often made without any understanding of its implications. If it means anything at all it implies that all who take vows of Church membership have a responsibility towards the flock. As well as priests, we should be shepherds, shepherds to this extent, at least, that there is laid upon us the duty of seeing that the youth of our land are taught the Christian doctrines and nurtured in the Christian faith, that they are guarded from the temptations of life's way, and that in the battle against evil we who are members of the Church must be in the firing line. There is a fight on all the time against the powers of evil and darkness, a fight that claims us even unto death, a fight that calls for courage, steadfastness and daring. We, too, must be fighting alongside our Master.

That is one great comfort—we are never alone. The Chief Shepherd is ever with us, our leader and our inspiration. Sometimes He calls us from the labours of the field and the heat of battle to refreshment, sometimes the invitation is to His table, there to partake of that spiritual nourishment which alone can give us strength for all the duties of life, and courage to face the dangers of life. Each day the door of His House is open, and we are called to His sanctuary there to receive the inspiration that we all so sorely need—the cleansing sense of forgiveness that will fit us for the battle of life and enable us to fight a better fight.

We are living in times when evil is on the march, when the wolves of unrighteousness seek to scatter and to destroy the flock, when every Christian must be on the alert against spiritual foes that are as dangerously deadly at home as they are abroad. War breeds temptations that peace knows nothing of. Let us see to it that we falter not in our fight for all that the Church of Christ stands for—truth, purity, honesty, righteousness, love—that in these difficult times we do not fail as servants of Christ in His Church, as under-shepherds of the flock.

There is nothing soft or weak about our Leader. He is the fighting Christ. He gave His life for the sheep. On the night on which He was betrayed He underlined this truth once more in immortal words: 'This is my body which is broken for you,' 'This is my life laid down for you.'

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

The tablets unearthed in the mound of Ras Shamra (Ugarit), together with the remarkable discoveries still being made there by Schaeffer, continue to shed an important light on Israelite history and customs. Fortunately, the tablets may now be dated more precisely, for in one of them the name of the king of Ugarit, *Nqmd* (=Nqm-Adad, a Semitic name), under whose reign the poems were composed, is associated with that of the great Hittite king, Shuppiluliuma (*c.* 1390–1364 B.C.). This places the tablets during the Amarna period, probably just after the Sa-Gaz (Ḫabiru or Hebrews) had invaded the land, though much of the material they contain certainly goes back to earlier ages.

Among the recent discoveries by Schaeffer bearing on the Old Testament, may be mentioned the following: *First*, in a stratum belonging to about 1500 B.C., he has uncovered a great paved hall (ninety-nine feet by thirty-three) used as a riding-school, along with an adjoining stable furnished with four mangers and a water-trough (all made of stone). The scheme reminds us of the buildings and equipment for Solomon's horses at Megiddo, except that, at Ras Shamra, the structure forms part of a building of enormous dimensions. A bronze bit, found near the stable, is of a small type, indicating that the species of horse used was relatively small, not unlike a pony. Evidence goes to show that Mitanni, with its Hurrian population, must have been the source from which Syria and Palestine drew their horses at this early time. It was the Mitannians, indeed, who first learned to train horses and drill them for use in battle with war-chariots. 'When their chariots came thundering across the plain,' says Schaeffer, 'infantry were scattered like autumn leaves.' Later on, after the kingdom of Mitanni had succumbed (*c.* 1350 B.C.), the Hittite lands became the chief centre of horse-breeding, and it was probably from these latter regions that the Tyrians obtained their horses (Ezk 27^{14}) and that Solomon procured them also (1 K 10^{28}, where 'Egypt' is a mistranslation for Muṣri). *Second*, from the same stratum, Schaeffer has recovered an exceptional number of arrows ('sons of the quiver,' La 3^{13} R.V.m.), showing that, apart from the dagger and the spear (which are of great antiquity), this form of weapon was probably the main one used in warfare in Palestine and neighbouring regions at this early date. This is corroborated by the Amarna Letters, where we find Palestinian rulers making earnest and repeated demands to the Pharaoh for 'archers' (*pidâtu*, cf.

Muss-Arnolt, 792). 'Amurri,' says Rib-Addi, 'longs day and night for the coming of the archers.' 'If archers are not here this year,' says Abdi-Hiba of Jerusalem, 'the lands of the king will be lost.' In later ages, battle-bows (Zec 9^{10} 10^{4}) developed a considerable size, some of them being four or five feet long, and the arrows shot from them must have been deadly. At Tell Jemmeh (probably Gerar) Petrie discovered arrow-heads specially made with such strength of penetration that they could pierce the breastplate. In the *Biblisches Reallexicon* (col. 410) K. Galling mentions a type of incendiary arrow found at Shechem, the blade-head of which was pierced with small holes into which oiled tow could be inserted and set on fire, with the object of causing conflagration (a contrivance which throws an excellent light on Ps 7^{13} R.V., 'He maketh his arrows fiery shafts'). *Third*, Schaeffer continues to discover signs of Hurrian influence at Ras Shamra. In particular, he has recently brought to light two beautiful copper statuettes of divinities (dating from the nineteenth or perhaps twentieth century), the art of which he regards as Hurrian. It was at the beginning of the second millennium or earlier that this non-Semitic race (Biblical 'Horites,' Egyptian *Haru*) from the Caucasian Highlands invaded Mesopotamia, coming afterwards into friendly contact with the Hebrews there, and influencing them largely in custom and habit. In this respect numerous analogies are found in the Old Testament, especially in the patriarchal folklore, between the two races.

Fourth, Schaeffer has found a battle-axe, dating from about 1400 B.C., or even earlier, the blade of which, according to analysis, is composed of iron which has been tempered and hardened ('fer aciéré,' as he calls it), thus revealing a knowledge of steel-making at this early period. It is the oldest weapon of iron so far discovered which has undergone a steel-making process, and it puts the existence of iron-work in Syria and Palestine farther back than hitherto supposed. In accord with this, Virolleaud has now found this metal mentioned, under its Hebrew name (*barzel*), in the recently discovered tablets. If we exclude the legend of the 'iron bedstead' of King Og (Dt 3^{11}), which is believed to have been a sarcophagus of black basalt (of which large numbers are found in the district), the earliest mention of iron in the Bible is found in the record of the Hebrew Conquest, which informs us (Jos 17^{16}, Jg 1^{19}) that the Hebrews could not drive out the Canaanites in the valleys because they had 'chariots of iron,' and in the story of Sisera (Jg 4^{13}) who is stated to have had nine hundred chariots of this type. In both of these instances, however, the date must be much later than 1400 B.C. The celebrated letter (found at Boghaz-keui) of the Hittite king, Hattushil III., to the Pharaoh Rameses II., in which he refers to iron, and which is often quoted as the earliest mention of smelted iron, cannot be placed earlier than *c.* 1300 B.C. In his letter Hattushil regrets being unable to send any 'good iron' (*i.e.* pure iron, probably steel), as the stocks at Kissuwadna were exhausted for the time being, but states that he was sending in the meantime a dagger-blade of iron (*i.e.* ordinary iron probably). The battle-axe, therefore, found at Ras Shamra, and dating from about the end of the fifteenth century B.C., puts iron-work, including steel-production, in these regions much further back than was suspected. It is evident that this metal was in considerable use by this time, though employed only for special purposes owing to the prevalence of copper and bronze. It is not generally realized by scholars that objects of iron and steel are mentioned several times in the Amarna correspondence, though statements to the contrary have often been made. In the letter, for example, of the Mitannian king, Tushratta, to Amenophis III. (*c.* 1415–1375 B.C.), dealing with the marriage of the former's daughter, Taduḫepa, to the latter and mentioning her marriage and dowry presents, we find reference not only to a *miṭṭu* (divine weapon) of iron (*parzillu*) but to bracelets (rings) and daggers of iron, as well as frequent references to weapons of steel (*ḫabal-kinu*).[1] In Tutankhamun's tomb Carter discovered no less than nineteen objects of iron, in spite of the fact that the Egyptians were not fond of this metal, all their wonderful work being done with copper and

[1] Ḫabal here is another form of Tabal (Hittite 'Tipal,' Hebrew 'Tubal,' Is 66^{19}, Ezk 27^{13}, etc.), the ancient iron-producing region between the Taurus and Anti-Taurus, known later to the Greeks as Tibarenia. Cf. Ḫabal-Kinu with Tubal-Cain (Gn 4^{22}), who was 'the father of all such as forge copper and iron.'

bronze. As this Pharaoh reigned *c.* 1365–1359 B.C., it is clear that iron was coming into frequent use by this time, not in a limited way for stray ornaments and other articles of value (specimens of this type, going back to the third millennium and certified to be non-meteoric, have been recovered from Ur, Kish, Tell Asmar, and Chagar Bazar), but in a fairly wide sense for industrial, warlike, and other purposes. The date 1200 B.C., fixed long ago by scholars for the commencement of the Early Iron Age, requires now to be set back considerably in the light of later knowledge.

Such facts deserve to be emphasized, because the Biblical reference to 'chariots of iron' at the time of the Israelite Conquest of Canaan has been used as an argument against the earlier date of the Conquest (*c.* 1400 B.C.). It is not realized, for one thing, that these chariots must have been built of wood (cf. Jos 11^{9}, 'burnt their chariots') and only strengthened with iron. Further, both in the case of Sisera's chariots and those of the Canaanites in the valleys, the date is certainly much later than the Israelite entry. In regard to Sisera, the events occurred (according to Jg 4) in the time of Deborah, and thus about two hundred years after the Conquest, though in another passage they have been ascribed to Joshua through the mixing apparently of two separate traditions: for Jabin, king of Hazor, mentioned in both accounts must be the same individual. As for the chariots of iron which prevented the Hebrews securing the valleys, probably they should also be placed sometime after the Hebrew entry, for the so-called Conquest, as we now know, was by no means either immediate or complete. Only very gradually did the Hebrews extend their occupation, and it must have been fifty, perhaps one hundred years or more, before they attacked or invaded certain portions of the land. Moreover, excavation is making it more and more evident that by 1400 B.C., as pointed out above, an abundance of iron could be secured from Mitanni (from which country the battle-axe discovered by Schaeffer is believed to have come). The territory of this powerful nation, consisting largely of Hurrians, included the high valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, and its control extended to the mountainous districts of the north and north-west, where the mining regions of Tabal and Armenia lay. It possessed a very advanced knowledge of the technique of iron and steel, and was the first country to turn this metal to ordinary use. It was undoubtedly this knowledge that contributed to the marvellous success that the Mitannian nation experienced for several centuries, and it was not until after its conquest by the Hittites that the supremacy in iron passed to the latter people.

Much light, as we know, has been cast on the Old Testament by the Tell el-Amarna Letters (*c.* 1400–1366 B.C.). Hitherto we have been dependent on Knudtzon's German translation, though it does not have the same authority now owing to modern discovery. A fresh reading of the Letters in the excellent English translation just published by Professor Mercer suggests one or two points of interest: (1) In No. 29, l. 39, there is mention of a 'tongue of gold.' The same word for 'tongue' (*lišânu*) is used as in Jos 7^{21}, where we read of Achan's 'wedge (*lĕshôn*) of gold.' In both cases a tongue-shaped ingot is probably meant. (2) In No. 55, Akizzi, king of Qatna (modern *el-Mishrifeh*, near Homs), complains to the Pharaoh (Amenophis III.) that the Hittite king had carried off the city's god (a sun-god), and had thus left the place in danger. The incident reminds us of the Philistines capturing the Ark (1 S 4^{4-7}), and the subsequent grief of the Israelites who thought they had lost Yahweh. (3) It is noteworthy that the plural word *ilâni* ('gods') takes a singular verb like the Hebrew *Elohim*, and has a singular meaning indicating majesty (cf. No. 96, 4; 141, 2; 147, 1; etc.). It is otherwise in the Hittite texts, where the expression *An-meš* ('gods') occurs only before a god-group and takes a plural signification. (4) According to the Letters, the term 'Canaan' (*Kinaḫi* or *Kinaḫni*) included more than we usually reckon, for its boundaries took in Acco, Tyre, Byblos, Hazor, Akshap, and other parts, while 'Amurru' included northern Syria. Professor Mercer compares the word 'Canaan' with the Sumerian *Ki-en-gi* ('low-land'), and derives it from the Hebrew root *Kana'* ('to be low'). This, however, leaves the problem of the final *-ni* unsolved, though this termination may only have been a Phœnician one

(it occurs only in the letters from Phœnicia). (5) One cannot but be struck with the remarkable demand made by some of the kings for presents, especially objects made of gold, silver, ivory, lapis-lazuli, and other valuable materials. Messengers to a king were always expected to be armed with such gifts, and there are numerous complaints of the inadequacy of them. The practice explains Jacob's advice to his sons on leaving for Egypt ('Carry down a present to the man,' Gn 43^{11}), and throws light on the 'asking' (not 'borrowing,' as in the A.V.) by the Israelites of jewelry and other articles from the Egyptians (Ex 11^{2} 12^{35}). Even the notion of propitiating the Deity in such a way was quite common, and appears in David's words to Saul, 'If Yahweh hath stirred thee up against me, let him be appeased by an oblation' (1 S 26^{19}).

Dr. Nelson Glueck has given further interesting reports of his excavations at Ezion-geber (modern *Tell el-Kheleifeh*). Altogether the town has passed through four stages. It was not built till the reign of Solomon (probably by him), for no trace of any construction or settlement earlier than this has been found on the site. Consequently, it cannot be the Ezion-geber at which the Israelites encamped on their journey to Canaan (Nu 33^{35}). The latter, as Dr. Glueck points out, must have been some small straggling site, with 'a few mud-brick huts,' situated farther to the east, but all traces of it have disappeared. Solomon's Ezion-geber, built on virgin soil, appears to have been laid waste by fire about the time of Shishak's invasion of Judah (*c.* 940 B.C.), and probably by this Pharaoh, who ravaged southern Palestine (1 K $14^{25ff.}$). A second settlement arose on the ashes, and once more the place became an important commercial, industrial, and shipping centre, but this town also fell a prey to fire. A third one (Elath), built on entirely new lines, has turned out to be the best preserved of them all. Among other things unearthed, there are large copper and iron nails resembling spikes, about two and a half inches long, probably used in the construction of boats; lumps of pitch, of which there seems to have been an abundance in the Arabah, for caulking the boats; and numerous fragments of rope of all sizes. Some of the thicker ropes, which must have been intended for use on the larger vessels ('ships of Tarshish'), have been made of hundreds of fibre threads taken from the bark of palm-trees and formed into coils, which were then wreathed or twisted threefold (cf. the 'wreathen work' of Ex 28^{14} R.V., and the 'threefold cord' of Ec 4^{12}).

There are three cases in the Old Testament where the word 'hand' (Hebrew *yād*) undoubtedly signifies 'memorial' or 'monument' (1 S 15^{12} R.V.m., 2 S 18^{18}, Is 56^{5} R.V.m.). The idea that in these cases a hand may have been carved on the stone has been amply confirmed within recent years. In some instances the hand is meant as that of a worshipper. It is outstretched, symbolizing the action which usually accompanied a vow or supplication (cf. Gn 14^{22}, Dt 32^{40}, etc.). Several votive steles of this nature have been discovered in Phœnicia and Carthage. In other instances the hand is that of a god or goddess held out in blessing. Henri Seyrig recently reports having found at *Arimeh*, in Syria, the lower part of a huge pillar with a representation of two right hands on it, one being that of the goddess Atargatis stretched forth to bless, and the other that of Hadad grasping a thunderbolt; and he draws attention to a Babylonian cylinder, belonging to the dynasty of Hammurabi, containing a very interesting image of a hand put forth in some act of adoration. Hopkins and Rowell, in their excavations at Dura, came across a hand carved out on a stone at the entry to a private house, where it was perhaps intended to avert the 'evil eye.' Such instances, and there are many more, explain why certain monuments were described by the Hebrew word *yād* ('hand'). In these cases this symbol must have been carved on them. Hence 'Absalom's monument' (2 S 18^{18} R.V.) was known as 'Absalom's hand.'

The Importance of a True Theology.

By the Reverend Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Jersey, U.S.A.

The late Dr. H. R. L. ('Dick') Sheppard, one of the best-known and best-loved English clergymen of his day, in a book entitled *My Cry for Christianity*, said this: 'Every few days I can count on someone writing to tell me what a much more happy and useful person I should be if only I should "heave all this dogma overboard."' Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, the well-known detective novelist, who has recently taken to writing religious pamphlets in defence of Christianity, comments on the same situation as follows: '"Any stigma," said a witty tongue, "will do to beat a dogma"; and the flails of ridicule have been brandished with such energy of late on the threshing-floor of controversy that the true seed of the Word has become well-nigh lost amid the whirling of chaff. Christ, in His Divine innocence, said to the Woman of Samaria, "Ye worship ye know not what"—being apparently under the impression that it might be desirable, on the whole, to know what one was worshipping. He thus showed Himself sadly out of touch with the twentieth-century mind, for the cry to-day is: "Away with the tedious complexities of dogma—let us have the simple spirit of worship; just worship, no matter of what"' (*Strong Meat*, 28–29).

Since I am persuaded that such an attitude of mind is not uncommon, I propose to address myself to a consideration of this topic—the importance of a true theology for religion and life.

I. The first point I wish to put is this: that as long as man has a mind to think with, and is prepared to use it, there will always be, and there must always be, a theology. For man—at his best at least—is so constituted that he must think about his experiences in life in a reasonable way, in order to make their meaning and implications clear to himself. Thus, the science of political economy is generally agreed to have been founded by the publication of Adam Smith's book, *The Wealth of Nations*, in 1776. Now this book grew out of Smith's reflections on the economic experience of Great Britain during the two centuries or so preceding its publication; Smith sought to make the nature and meaning of that experience clear to himself and to all who might care to listen to him. Smith's views, of course, have had to be revised in the light of subsequent economic experience, so that political economy to-day is a very different thing from what it was in Smith's hands; but that only bears out the fact I am at present stressing, namely, that man having a mind, feels constrained to use it to reflect on the nature and meaning of his experiences. Again, when, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, physical science made such rapid strides under investigators like Charles Darwin and Alfred Russell Wallace, there were those who, reflecting on this scientific experience of the physical world, not only drew certain conclusions as to how this world came into being, but even declared that it was so 'lapped in universal law' as to admit of no intervention by any transcendent God. Matthew Arnold, who, though a literary man and not a scientist, accurately reflected this trend of the scientific discussion of his day when he stated quite categorically in his volume, *Literature and Dogma*, that 'miracles do not happen.' Present-day physical science has shed much of this earlier dogmatism: Professor J. H. Poynting said this at the British Association in 1900, 'We must confess that physical laws have greatly fallen off in dignity. No long time ago they were quite commonly described as the Fixed Laws of Nature, and were supposed sufficient in themselves to govern the universe. Now we can only assign to them the humble rank of mere descriptions, often erroneous, of similarities which we believe we have observed.' Quite clearly, physical science has continued to reflect on its experiences in the realm of Nature—as it is perfectly entitled, and even bound, to do.

Now if it is true that man is so constituted that he must think about his experiences as intelligently

as he can, surely this applies particularly to his religious experiences, which affect him most vitally, at the deepest depths of his being. Let a man come into saving contact with God through Jesus Christ, let him find in Jesus that renewal, enrichment, and deep-seated joy which are the hall-marks of an authentic Christian experience, and of course he will have to think about this re-vitalizing experience which has altered his life so transformingly at its roots. He will have, as a thinking human being, to consider what light this new experience throws on such fundamental questions as the nature and character of God, His revelation of Himself, and His purpose for mankind. The fruit of such thinking and reflection is theology, which has been defined by Dr. Emil Brunner as 'the intellectual elaboration of the knowledge of God and His Word.' This, for example, is what actually happened to the Apostle Paul; throughout his writings he explores and expounds the meaning of that new and rich and wonderful experience 'in Christ' which began so dramatically on the Damascus road. And all true Christian theology has had the same inspiration and basis in Christian experience.

My point is this: that Christian theology is not something which has been produced by metaphysicians sitting in the rarefied atmosphere of a study and, out of their own inner consciousness, blowing intellectual soap-bubbles: it is the expression and interpretation, in reasoned terms, of a deep experience, and of its meaning for life.

II. But theology has other uses besides the giving of intellectual satisfaction. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, President of Union Theological Seminary, in his volume *What to Preach*, has a passage (p. 47 ff.) in which he points out that a true theology may advance, reinforce, and enrich actual Christian experience. This is what he says: 'Nothing is so practical as doctrine of the right kind. Back of all our helps to healthy and capable living—inoculations which immunize from disease, a synthesis of chemicals which yields a dye or a new metal, the structure of a craft that navigates the air—lie correct interpretations of the forces of which our world is built up. Such interpretations are never regarded as final—they are revised and amplified from time to time, with resultant improvements in the applications made from them for utilitarian ends. Explanations of the spiritual universe—of God and His purpose, His redeeming love, His empowering presence, of man and his temptations, his sin, his salvation, his reinforcements, his destiny, are of even more value for vigorous and victorious life. Such explanations are never final or complete, but they confer inestimable gifts and graces.

'We agree that theology and religion are not identical, that religion precedes and is far more important than theology, and that doctrines are man's attempts, always provisional, to rationalize his experiences of God. But it is also true that theology enriches religion, that expectation makes possible experience, and that to teach doctrine which sets forth what God is and does should open doors into ampler life with Him. St. Paul found a group of earnest men at Ephesus who were followers of John the Baptist, but knew nothing of the possession of the Spirit. Their expectation restricted their experience; their meagre theology limited their religion. When he explained to them Jesus and the Spirit given to believers in Him, their life was enlarged. Their new experience at once found expression, and characteristic first-century expression, for there are fashions in religious forms, "They spake with tongues and prophesied."'

III. More than that. A true Christian theology is of vital importance in this, that it is the only possible basis of Christian ethics. Some observers of this present-day world have sought to explain our troubles and discontents by saying that there has been a moral collapse, in individual lives and in the relations of groups and peoples to one another. Well, of course, it is not open to any question that there has been such a moral collapse, of which there is abundant and painful evidence on almost every hand. 'Man's inhumanity to man' is still making countless thousands mourn. But fundamentally the collapse in the world to-day is not merely moral, but spiritual. It is a break-down in respect of the whole conception of life, its origin, its meaning, its destiny—in fact, in respect of man's relation to God. The more acute and penetrating observers of our contemporary scene—whether they are Christians or not—recognize this. For example,

Mr. J. B. Priestley, the well-known English novelist and publicist, in a recent article entitled 'Where are We Going?' after analysing our present troubles, says this: 'You cannot explain the present state of the world simply in terms of economics and politics. You have to go deeper, down into the mysterious dimly-lit realm of men's belief about themselves and their destiny and the nature of the universe. The underlying causes are philosophical and religious. The very denial of this fact, which we hear so often, is itself a symptom of our spiritual sickness.'

Just as the diagnosis of a moral collapse is inadequate, inasmuch as it does not go deep enough, so the suggestion that a return to the ethic of Jesus is what is necessary to heal our wounds and make us whole once more, will not do. For it fails to take account of this important fact, that the Christian ethic is rooted and grounded in Christian belief, in Christian theology. Jesus Christ's ethical teaching was based upon, and grew out of, His religious message. That is to say, there have been moralists who have based their ethical teaching on such humanitarian considerations as the greatest happiness of the greatest number—as Jeremy Bentham did in the nineteenth century—or on such prudential considerations as the economic enrichment or the political advancement of the State. But Jesus' ethical teaching was determined by one fundamental truth, namely, that God meant human life to be lived in the way in which He taught.

Thus, as Dr. E. F. Scott points out in his book, *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*: 1. The motives by which Jesus Christ's ethic is inspired are religious. That is to say, when He deals with a man's duty to his neighbours He does not speak about the constitution of man's nature or his obligations as a member of society: He says that each individual has an inherent and inalienable value in the sight of Almighty God. This has often been pointed out as a unique feature of Jesus Christ's religious teaching, that He taught that God valued not merely groups, nor great persons, but the individual as such—Luke 15 is surely an exposition of this great truth. Now just because each individual is so precious and valuable in God's eyes, he must be treated not as a means but as an end in himself. 'It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble' (Lk $17^{1,2}$).

2. The power required to carry out Jesus Christ's ethic is to be had only in religion—His religion. Jesus' ethical teaching cannot be truly practised except by such as have come into saving contact with God, and have had their hearts cleansed and their wills renewed by Him. The teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels does not consist of a number of acts, to be followed outwardly and to the letter. His teaching consists rather in a series of examples of the spirit in which His followers will seek to handle victoriously every situation which may confront them in life. Thus, to carry out Christ's teaching in its essential inwardness, a man must be renewed in his heart and will. And such renewal he can acquire only by accepting it at the hand of God, with whom he comes into fellowship in Christ Jesus.

3. The aim and goal of Jesus Christ's ethic is likewise religious. The Christian ethic fulfils itself in a spirit akin to that of God. As E. F. Scott says: 'He (Jesus) thinks of God not as the absolute Being, but as the God of love, righteousness, holiness. These moral qualities are His essential nature, and to be one with God can be nothing else than to have in ourselves the will of God. In so far as we attain to goodness, mercy, long-suffering, we truly share in the divine nature—we have become "children of our Father who is in heaven" . . . He is possessed with the thought of love and goodness as so inherent in the divine nature that by attaining to them we apprehend God. In every act of justice and compassion we become for the moment one with God, and by constant obedience to His will we live the divine life. . . . His precepts lose all their meaning when they are construed on the ground of any prudential or social philosophy. His thought is always that by living as God requires we become like God, and so realize in ourselves more of the divine life.'[1]

[1] *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, 40–1.

In a word, the Divine indicative precedes and is the ground of the Divine imperative. To attempt to separate Christian ethics from Christian theology is to cut Christian ethics off from its roots.

IV. My final consideration is this. Man is so constituted that he must have a belief of some kind about this universe, in which he lives, moves, and has his being. The well-known dictum that 'nature abhors a vacuum,' is nowhere more true than in the religious sphere. Herbert Spencer, the English philosopher, explaining the fact that as life went on he came to view religious institutions with an ever more tolerant and even benignant eye, said this: 'Largely, if not chiefly, this change of feeling towards religious creeds and their sustaining institutions, has resulted from a deepening conviction that the sphere occupied by them can never become an unfilled sphere, but that there must continue to arise afresh the great questions concerning ourselves and surrounding things; and that, if not positive answers, then modes of consciousness standing in place of positive answers, must ever remain.' (*Autobiography*, ii. 469).

The truth of Spencer's statement has received several striking illustrations in recent years. For example, Soviet Russia is a country which officially has abandoned Christianity, and indeed all other religions; and the government has placed serious difficulties in the way of all who wish to profess and practise the religion of Jesus Christ. But for all that, it would be quite wrong to suppose that Bolshevik Russia has got rid of all religion and theology. Far from it. It has merely given itself over to an inferior religion, the religion of Communism, the religion of Karl Marx and his disciple Lenin; it has merely substituted St. Marx for St. Mark! And of course this religion has its orthodox theology, embalmed in *Das Kapital*, Marx's *magnum opus*.

Again, consider what has been happening recently in Nazi Germany. It is true that in the official Party Programme it is stated that the Nazi movement stands for 'a positive Christianity.' But this is merely another illustration of the dictum that a political platform is like a railroad platform—not something to stand on, but rather something to get in on! For it is notorious that since Hitler's rise to power in 1933 the German people—especially the children—have been taught to despise and reject essential Christianity. But these Germans who have thus given up traditional Christianity have not abandoned religion. They have merely espoused another and different kind of religion, namely, the pagan religion of blood and race. This religion has its 'little blond Aryan God,' as Dr. Halford Luccock says; and it likewise has its accompanying theology, based on the alleged inherent superiority of the Nordic race, and especially the Germans, and the right of this race to dominate all others. In a word, the adherents of this neo-paganism have merely substituted salvation by Nordic blood for salvation by the blood of Jesus Christ.

These are examples taken from Europe, but illustrations are not wanting in U.S.A. as well. Some years ago the so-called Humanist movement, I will not say flourished, but at least enjoyed a certain measure of popularity in the United States. These Humanists were men who had abandoned historic Christianity with its claim to enjoy intercourse with a transcendent God above; their motto might well have been the notorious line of Algernon Charles Swinburne,

> 'Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things.'

But though they thus repudiated the Christian religion and its theology, they did not get rid of all theology. On the contrary, they had quite a definite theology of their own. Its four fundamental tenets were thus stated by Dr. John H. Dietrich:

1. The conviction that man 'as the highest product of the creative process,' with 'nothing above or beyond him' but his own ideals, is 'an end in himself,' and not 'a means for carrying out the purposes of a superior being.'

2. 'Faith in the possibility of improving human life.'

3. 'Belief in the essential unity of mankind, and the necessity of bringing man to a consciousness of this unity.'

4. 'Faith in man—belief that the power to realize these great ideals lies in man himself,' and not in any 'friendly providence' or 'miracle-

working God'—quoted by W. M. Horton (*Theism and the Modern Mood*, 54).

The fact is that, as Brunner says, man is a theological animal. And that if he does not have Christian theology, he will have recourse to theology of a different and inferior kind.

Such considerations as these serve to bring out the first-rate importance of a true Christian theology. And the exposition of such a theology is the responsibility—a responsibility which ought to be regarded as a privilege—of every Christian teacher.

The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus.[1]

By the Reverend C. A. Phillips, M.A., Bournemouth.

As soon as possible after the arrival of Codex Sinaiticus, the Trustees of the British Museum published, in 1934, a popular account of its history and leading features under the title 'The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible.' This has now for some time been out of print, but the demand for such an account is by no means exhausted. But instead of the reprint of a somewhat hastily made study, a new pamphlet has been produced by two of the Assistant Keepers of the Museum, Mr. H. J. M. Milne and Mr. T. C. Skeat, containing in a modified form the substance of the former, with the addition of the results of some of the research which the authors have been making during the past four years, and which are embodied in *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* published last year. There has been added a shorter account of the other great Biblical Treasure of the Museum, Codex Alexandrinus.

Readers who are already acquainted with the story of Sinaiticus will turn to see what is the latest opinion about its date and provenance, the scribes, the correctors, and the character of the text. The evidence for the date and home of the MS. has been freshly and carefully sifted; the former is confirmed to be the first half of the fourth century, the latter remains uncertain, and opinion is still divided between Palestine and Egypt. Several phenomena point to Cæsarea; there is the curious error in Mt 13^{54} εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα for εἰς τὴν πατρίδα, which, as Dr. Rendel Harris remarked fifty years ago, suggests that the scribe came from that neighbourhood[2]; and again in Ac 8^{5} he has written 'Philip went down to *Cæsarea*.' There are the C correctors of the seventh century: C^{a} supports many readings of the 'Cæsarean' text used by Origen during his residence in Cæsarea; and there is the corrector of about the same date, known as C^{Pamp}, who used for revising 2 Esdras and Esther 'an exceedingly ancient copy which was corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus . . . in the prison by the great favour and enlargement of God . . .' 'This copy contained 1 Kings to Esther and was copied and corrected from the Hexapla of Origen corrected by himself.' Pamphilus was martyred at Cæsarea about A.D. 309. And then there is the famous order given to Eusebius of Cæsarea by Constantine in A.D. 332 for fifty just such 'fine' volumes of the Holy Scriptures; and though there is no evidence that our MS. was ever in Constantinople, some further copies may well have been made for the local Church after the Imperial order had been completed. On the other hand, ℵ does not follow the Hexaplaric text of Origen, which, according to Jerome writing at the end of the fourth century, was almost universal, especially in Palestine. Lake ascribed some of the peculiar letters of the MS. to Egypt; but these have since been remarked elsewhere.

The MS. gives some clear evidence that scribes

[1] British Museum, printed by order of the Trustees, 1938.

[2] *Stichometry*, 75.

'It is to my mind much the same as if a printed text of Shakespeare should put into Mark Antony's speech the line:

"I come to Banbury Cæsar, not to praise him."

Such a text would probably be the work of Oxford printers.'

wrote from dictation: phonetic errors in spelling occur throughout, especially where scribe B is responsible—in the Prophets and the Shepherd. There is a curious instance in 1 Mac 5^{20} where the reading should be *eight thousand*, written as a numeral thus: 'H; the reader, puzzled over an obscure place, must have called out *either six or three thousand*, which the scribe has thoughtlessly written down word for word (H̄GH̄F̄), and left uncorrected.

The text, as is well known, supports in the main Codex Vaticanus in forming the basis of the Neutral text of the N.T. as edited by Westcott and Hort and followed by the Revisers: but it contains also a number of 'Western' and other elements. There is a useful list of some twenty-six notable readings,

1. Neutral readings, as the shorter form of Mt 5^{44}, the omission of Mt $16^{2.3}$ and of the end of Mk 16^{9-20}.
2. Where the Neutral text is 'unquestionably wrong,' the conflation in Lk 10^{42} and the insertion of the 'Piercing of the Side' at Mt 27^{49}.[1]
3. Where it will oppose the Vatican MS., *e.g.* in the two famous passages Lk 22^{43-44} 23^{34} which B omits and the first hand of ℵ adds, and though an early corrector has marked for omission, a later has deleted the asterisks.
4. Where it supports the Western text, *e.g.* Lk 24^{51}, omitting (first hand) *and was carried up into heaven*. This is especially noticeable in the Fourth Gospel where, in addition to the two examples given (Jn 2^{3} and 4^{9}), there are numerous smaller readings attested otherwise only by Codex Bezæ and the Latin, though it joins the Vatican and the Oriental Versions in rejecting the Pericope de adultera (Jn 7^{53} to 8^{12}).

The assistance of the violet light has made two important contributions. It has finally solved the problem of the last verse of the Fourth Gospel. Tischendorf from the first noted the different colour of the ink, and also some minute differences in the hand, and attributed the verse to the later scribe D; though Lake and our authors do not follow him there, most apparatus quote the first hand of ℵ for omission; and 'it has been convincingly argued on grounds of contents, style, and language that this verse is an addition to the Gospel written when the original conclusion $20^{30.31}$ was accidentally transferred to the end of the preceding chapter.'[2] But why, as Hort asks, did the scribe originally leave what he considered the end of the Gospel without the usual colophon and ornament, with which he concludes Matthew and Luke? The violet rays now reveal the colophon and ornament beneath v.[25]: the scribe must have *washed off*, instead of erasing them, before appending this later conclusion.

There are nearly 15,000 corrections in the MS. most of them where the scribe himself has corrected obvious errors, some denoting variants otherwise attested, and just a few remain, where the erasure over which the scribe writes had still to be accounted for. Among these was Mt 6^{25} where the words αὐξάνουσιν to νήθουσιν are written over an erasure. Dr. Skeat elsewhere tells the story of his discovery.[3] Some months after he had been studying this place in the MS. in vain, he was glancing at some fragments of an uncanonical Gospel from Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy., iv. 655.[4]) where the papyrus runs:

[πολ]λω κρει[σ.
σον]ες [εστε] των [κρι
νων ατι[να α]υξα
νει ουδε ν[ηθ]ει .

'As I read this, it struck me that ἄτινα αὐξάνει οὐδὲ νήθει is really intolerable Greek for "which grow but spin not" . . . But is αὐξάνει in fact an inevitable reading?' Examination of the facsimile disclosed that the second α of αὐξάνει is a mere speck in the broken edge of the papyrus, and might well have been followed by another letter or two. From this it was but a step to conjecture that the original reading was ἄτινα οὐ ξαίνει οὐδὲ νήθει, "which neither card nor spin" giving an excellent sense, without

[1] This appears to have occurred here in one form of the Eastern Diatessaron.

[2] L. Vaganay, 'La Finale du quatrième Évangile,' in *Revue Biblique*, xlv. (1936), 512–28.

[3] 'The Lilies of the Field,' in *Z.N.T.W.*, xxxvii. (1938), 211–214.

[4] Which also contains the second century 'Western' reading ἐκρύφατε for ἤρατε in Lk 11^{52}.

doing violence to the remnants of writing visible. There now seemed to be an outside chance that the papyrus might in some way help to solve the problem in the Sinaiticus. So far were expectations exceeded, indeed, that with the assistance of the ultra-violet lamp, every letter of the original (erased) writing was eventually deciphered as follows :

ΤΑΚΡΙΝΑΤΟΥ	*τα κρινα του*
ΑΓΡΟΥΠΩΣΟΥΞΕ	*αγρου πως ου ξε*
ΝΟΥΣΙΝΟΥΔΕΝΗ	*νουσιν ουδε νη*
ΘΟΥΣΙΝΟΥΔΕΚΟΠΙ	*θουσιν ουδε κοπι*
ΩΣΙΝ.'	*ωσιν.'*

He then compares with this the Lucan version (12^{27}) of the saying in its Western form, *πῶς οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει*, which many regard as the original. 'To dissect this passage with the scalpel of textual criticism seems at first sight to verge on sacrilege . . . but while *οὐ ξαίνει* gives impeccable sense, *αὐξάνει*, on the other hand, if not actually redundant adds very little' to the picture. The unsuitability was clearly felt by the scribe of the Old Latin version *e* (Palatinus) who adds *et florescunt* after *crescunt*, while the new word implements the way in which the Master noted, used, and turned the common familiar prose of daily work into the rhythm and message of His teaching.

The account of Codex Alexandrinus tells of its presence in Constantinople in the seventeenth century and its presentation to Charles I. in 1627 by the patriarch Cyril Lucar, as a token of gratitude for the support given by the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, to the Orthodox Church in the unceasing struggle against Latin aggression backed up by the French Embassy. Cyril had been Patriarch of Alexandria and had probably brought it with him from the Patriarchal Library in Cairo; for the only previous fact known about the MS. comes from an Arabic note, recently proved to be of the thirteenth or fourteenth and not of the seventeenth century, entered on the first leaf of Genesis. 'Bound to the Patriarchal Cell in the Fortress of Alexandria. He that lets it go out shall be cursed and ruined.' The humble Athanasius wrote (this).[1]

The text as well as the script is definitely later—about a century—than that of ℵ or B, and shows already many of the changes which resulted in the Textus Receptus; but the text of Deuteronomy is very close to that of a papyrus 600 years older in the Rylands Library, and much nearer to B. It was our earliest witness for Genesis till the discovery of the Chester-Beatty Papyrus, and still holds the primacy for 2, 3 Maccabees and the Clementine Epistles.

There are six plates—the frontispiece is a view of the Monastery of S. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; there are two specimen pages of Sinaiticus, one from the O.T. Ps 19^{8} to 23^{5}, the other from the N.T. Lk 19^{13} to 20^{34}, the former in two columns, the latter in four; the fourth plate gives two photos of the end of S. John's Gospel, (1) its present appearance, (2) as it is shown up by the violet rays with the underlying colophon and ornaments; and the last two are specimen pages of Alexandrinus from O.T. and N.T., both in two columns and giving the end of 2 Es 23^{21-31} and the beginning of 1 Mac 1^{1-23}, and the end of Jude 12–25 and the opening of Ro 1^{1-27}.

[1] This Athanasius is usually identified with Athanasius III., the Melchite patriarch about 1300.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark's Little Apocalypse: A Hypothesis.

THE question as to how far Jesus accepted the apocalyptic beliefs of His time has been and still is greatly in debate. The eschatological passages of the Gospels have been thoroughly studied for indications one way or another. Consequently, the so-called little Apocalypse in Mark 13 has found an important place in New Testament exegesis.

In 1864, Timothée Colani (*Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de Son Temps*, 204 ff.) put forth the theory that Mk 13^{3-37} was not an authentic report of Jesus' teaching but rather a separate, brief Apocalypse put into His mouth by the author of the Gospel. In proof of this, Colani sets forth

the proposition that all ancient Apocalypses divided the future into three parts: (*a*) preliminary trials and tests; (*b*) a bloody persecution; and (*c*) the end or final catastrophe. Now, he goes on to say, all these periods can be found in Mk 13, and even the actual technical words are used. The preliminary tests are set forth as heresies begun by those who claim to be Messiahs (vv.[5-6]), as 'wars and rumours of wars' (v.[7]), as earthquakes and famines (v.[8]). The bloody persecution is found in the betrayal of believers to the authorities by countrymen and even relatives (vv.[9-13]). The end and final catastrophe is begun by the 'abomination of desolation standing where he ought not' (v.[14]). The way of safety then will be flight to the mountains in the face of a destruction such as the world has never seen since the time of creation (v.[19]). False Christs and false prophets will appear (v.[22]); the sun and moon will be darkened (v.[24]); the stars will fall (v.[25]); the Son of man will come with the angels to gather together the elect (vv.[26-27]); and all this will happen before the end of the present generation (v.[30]).

From this outline, then, Colani comes to the conclusion which he states in the following words: 'We have before us a short Apocalypse by an unknown author, which the Synoptists have taken for a discourse of Jesus and which they have inserted into their accounts' (p. 207).

As we turn to a careful study of Mk 13 it seems impossible to say that all of vv.[3-37] were originally in the Apocalypse. They were no doubt in it as Mark found it. The version as it came to Mark seems to have dated from about A.D. 52, for it shows the influence of Paul's doctrine of a personal Antichrist which he puts forth in 2 Th 2[3-4]. This is seen clearly in the masculine participle ἑστηκότα modifying the neuter noun βδέλυγμα in v.[14].

The setting for the Apocalypse in Mark's Gospel is the story of the widow's mite in 12[41-44]. After this incident, as Jesus comes out of the Temple, one of the disciples admires the magnificence of the buildings, only to call forth the saying that the time would come when not one stone would be left upon another (vv.[1-2]). Then, as Jesus goes to the Mount of Olives, He is asked by Peter, James, John, and Andrew, when these things will come to pass. The disciples are warned against false Messiahs who proclaim the end. Now begins what seems to be the original Apocalypse in vv.[7-8], with a description, common to all apocalyptic writings, of the Messianic woes. After v.[8] the editor places a passage illustrative of contemporary Christian life, especially true in Paul's case, when Christians are brought before governors and councils and kings, and are betrayed even by their own relatives (vv.[9-13]). Once again the original Apocalypse resumes in v.[14] with the statement about the 'abomination of desolation.' This phrase comes originally from Dn 9[27], having special reference to the desecration of the altar in Jerusalem by the sacrifice of swine's flesh on it under the brutal persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. (1 Mac 1[54]). But in the present context, we cannot but think that it has close affinity with the events of Jewish life in the first half of the first century A.D. Caligula became Roman Emperor in A.D. 37, due to his popularity with the army. His desire for recognition of his self-assumed divinity led him to demand that a statue of himself be set up in the court of the Temple at Jerusalem. While Herod Agrippa, who was then in Rome, tried to dissuade the emperor from such a mad idea, the procurator of Judæa delayed carrying out the order as long as possible, for he feared a revolt of the Jews. In A.D. 41, Caligula was assassinated, thereby saving the Jews from what would have been deepest humiliation. But out of the white heat of anger and resentment came this Apocalypse, with the 'abomination of desolation' not the polluted altar of Maccabean times, but the threatened desecration of the Temple by an emperor's statue. This original Apocalypse continues to v.[20].

In vv.[21-23] there is another Christian interpolation, a warning against false Messiahs and false prophets, who would seek to lead astray even the most faithful of Christians.

In vv.[24-27], we have the final passage from the original Apocalypse. These verses echo the words of 1 Enoch, when they state that the sun and moon will cease to shine and that the stars will fall, after which the Son of man will come with His angels to gather together the elect, apparently with a view to setting up the Kingdom of God upon earth.

The rest of the chapter is made up of sayings of Jesus about the end—the sign of the fig-tree (vv.[28-29]) and the parable of the man whose servants were commanded to watch over his possessions in his absence (vv.[34-37]).

What we have tried to show in this discussion may be summarized as follows:

(1) Originally there was a short Jewish Apocalypse contained in vv.[7-8. 14-20. 24-27]. This was written out of the anger on the part of the Jews against Caligula because of his unreasonable demand that his statue be set up in the court of the Temple. Thus we may date this original Apocalypse about A.D. 41.

(2) When this Apocalypse came into the hands of a Jewish-Christian writer, he revised it about

A.D. 52, including in it sayings of Jesus in vv.[3-6. 9-13. 21-23. 28-37], and changing the 'abomination of desolation' from an allusion to a statue to a reference to a personal Antichrist under the influence of Paul in 2 Thessalonians.

(3) This revised Apocalypse was incorporated into Mark's Gospel because it fitted so well into the time in which he was writing—the time when Nero was persecuting the Christians mercilessly and when Paul was either in prison or had been put to death.

LYLE O. BRISTOL.

New York

Entre Nous.

Winifred Holtby.

A biography eagerly waited for is *Testament of Friendship* by Vera Brittain, just published by Messrs. Macmillan.

In the last year of her life Winifred Holtby was invited to write her autobiography by three leading London publishers. 'I don't see how I can write an autobiography,' she said [to Vera Brittain]. 'I never feel I've really had a life of my own. My existence seems to me like a clear stream which has simply reflected other people's stories and problems.' While that impression is untrue, as the biographer says, the outstanding feeling that one gets is the selflessness of her life. For example, there is her work for South African natives. Anything which savoured of injustice or inequality stirred her not only to indignation but to devoted help. She was responsible for sending William Ballinger out to South Africa to organize the natives, contributing £100 yearly herself towards his salary, and she wrote 'literally millions of words about Ballinger.'

South Riding was undoubtedly Winifred Holtby's finest literary work, and when she wrote it—it was only published after her death—'her radiant life had not reached its prime nor her vital work its zenith.'

After she learned from a London specialist that she might not have more than two years to live, she went to the country to Monks Risborough. 'On one of the coldest mornings of that spring . . . she went for a walk past Clare Leighton's cottage to a farm farther up the hill. She felt tired and dejected; her mind, still vigorously alive in her slow, impaired body, rebelled bitterly against her fate. Why, she wondered, should she, at thirty-three, not yet in the fullness of her developing powers, be singled out for this cruel unforeseen blow? . . .

'Just then she found herself standing by a trough outside the farmyard; the water in it was frozen, and a number of young lambs were struggling beside it vainly trying to drink. She broke the ice for them with her stick, and as she did so she heard a voice within her saying: "Having nothing, yet possessing all things." It was so distinct that she looked round, startled, but she was alone with the lambs on the top of the hill. Suddenly, in a flash, the grief, the bitterness, the sense of frustration disappeared; all desire to possess power and glory for herself vanished away, and never came back. . . . She always associated it afterwards with the words of Bernard Bosanquet on Salvation:

"'And now we are saved absolutely, we need not say from what, we are at home in the universe, and, in principle and in the main, feeble and timid creatures as we are, there is nothing anywhere within the world or without it that can make us afraid."'

Jewish Thought.

During the last war an anthology was prepared by the Chief Rabbi. It has now been revised and re-issued by him for the use of His Majesty's Jewish soldiers, sailors, and airmen. The title is *A Book of Jewish Thoughts* (Edward Goldston, 43 Russell Square, W.C.; 2s. 6d. net). It is a fine collection, and especially in these days of anti-Semitism we would recommend it for the reading of Jews and Christians alike. The first of the two selections chosen for quotation is by Mr. Moses Gaster, who died last year and who will be remembered as a contributor from time to time to this magazine. The second quotation is by the seventeenth-century mystic, Isaac Luria.

JEWISH HISTORY.

'The high-road of Jewish history leads to wide outlooks. That which is great and lasting in Jewish history is the spiritual wealth accumulated through the ages; the description of the fierce battles fought between the powers of darkness and light, of freedom and persecution, of knowledge and ignorance. Our great men are the heroes of the school and the sages of the synagogue, not the knights of the sanguinary battlefield. No widow was left to mourn through our victory, no mother for her lost son, no orphan for the lost father.'

A Sabbath Table Song.

Treasure of heart for the broken people,
Gift of new soul for the souls distrest,
Soother of sighs for the prisoned spirit—
The Sabbath of rest.
This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

When the work of the worlds in their wonder was finished
Thou madest this day to be holy and blest,
And those heavy-laden find safety and stillness,
A Sabbath of rest.
This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

Thy will be done.

'Thy Will: I accept the rule of God, whatever it may be, for myself, as well as working for it—the prayer of docility. That means a total capitulation to the mysterious Divine purpose; war declared on individual and corporate self-centredness, death to an earthbound, meticulous or utilitarian piety. It asks of the soul a heroic and liberating dedication to the interests of Reality; that, transcending the problems and needs of our successive existence, we may be made partners in the one august enterprise of the Spirit. This, says St. Paul, is the very meaning of the Passion: "that they which live shall no longer live unto themselves . . . wherefore, if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature"—his interests have become identical with those of the supernatural world. "Our wills are ours to make them thine" is not a mere bit of Victorian moralizing, but an almost perfect description of man's metaphysical state.'[1]

Canon Hannay.

'Like many others I have been beset all my life by doubts and questionings. Only, like Browning's prelate, I have deliberately chosen to live "A life of faith diversified by doubt," rather than the other alternative. "A life of doubt diversified by faith." One of the two I had to live and the choice was mine. Only, having chosen, I have ever in my heart the prayer of the father of the epileptic boy, "Lord, I believe. Help thou mine unbelief."

'There may well be others, perhaps many, whose position is like mine. It may comfort them to know that the passing of years dulls the doubts, even if it does not answer the questions. The choice of the life of faith justifies itself more and more. The chess-board—it is Browning's metaphor—ceases to be simply black and white. The white squares predominate. The black squares fade. And this is, as I believe, not the result of a weary decay of mental powers, but the answer to the repeated prayer. He has helped my unbelief.'

This is from the Preface to *The Potter's Wheel*, a small book of essays by Canon J. O. Hannay (George A. Birmingham). The publishers are Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. (3s. 6d. net). The essays—Thoughts on the Ways of God with Men—are eminently readable and are varied in subject, dealing with Old Testament and New Testament themes.

[1] Evelyn Underhill, *Abba*, 42.

Bible Reading.

'In the far interior, where the cult of Islam is widespread, young men were making merry over an old one who was a zealous reader of the Koran. "You will soon know your Koran by heart," they said. "Don't you get sick of always reading the same thing?" "For me," he replied, "it is by no means the same Koran. When I was a boy I understood it as a boy. When I was a man in my prime I understood it as a man, and now I am old I understand it as an old man. I read it again and again because, for me, it always contains something new."'[2]

Rejoicing in His habitable earth.

'In all the accounts given by natives who have returned from Europe I have always noticed that it is not railways and aeroplanes, but the cultivation of the soil that makes the greatest impression. My own experience on my way home is the same. The city, the hotel, the railway all seem at once familiar again. But then to travel across the country where field follows field—*that* is so unusual and seems to me so grand a thing that I am stirred to the very depths of my being. In Europe man is lord over the earth. In the primeval forest of Equatorial Africa he is a creature that with difficulty wrests a bit of land from the wilderness. His plantation is always surrounded by forest and sooner or later the forest will swallow it up again.'[3]

[2] A. Schweitzer, *From My African Notebook*, 109.
[3] *Ibid.*, 131.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.